The
Catholic Historical Review

VOLUME III JULY, 1917 NUMBER 2

JUAN RODRIGUEZ DE FONSECA: FIRST PRESIDENT OF THE INDIES (1493-1523)

Down on the Pacific coast of Central America, the republics of Nicaragua, Salvador and Honduras meet in a wide bay, the Bahia de Fonseca, so named on the twenty-sixth of January, 1522, by its discoverer, Gil González Dávila; and this is America's only memorial to the man who for thirty years—from 1493 to 1523—guided her destinies. Juan Rodríguez de Fonseca, Count of Pernia, was Bishop successively of Badajoz, Córdoba, Palencia and Burgos, Archbishop of Rosano, and first President of the Council of the Indies. America has never given a monument to her "first President," and with but few exceptions, every historical reference to Fonseca during the past 400 years has been made the occasion of an attack upon his character. Irving[1] has given us a

[1] *Columbus*, 5 vols., New York, 1892, Appendix 34. The traditional view of Fonseca is given by LAS CASAS, *Historia de las Indias*, 5 vols., Madrid, 1875; HERRERA, *Historia General*, Madrid, 1601; BERNAL DIAZ DEL CASTILLO, *Conquista de Nueva España*, Madrid, 1853; and others. QUINTANA (*Historia de Hombres Célebres*, Madrid, 1852) and PRESCOTT (*Conquest of Mexico*, 2 vols., New York, 1886) follow these sources, as do most modern writers, with the notable exception of THACHER (*Columbus*, New York, 1904); and FERNÁNDEZ DURO (*Amigos y Enemigos de Colón*, Madrid, 1892). A favorable view of Fonseca is presented by SIGÜENZA in his *Historia de la Orden de San Jerónimo*, Madrid, 1909; SOLÍS, *Conquista de Méjico*, Madrid, 1853, and BERNÁLDEZ, *Historia de los Reyes Católicos*, Madrid, 1878. Irving is mistaken in crediting to Bernáldez a veiled enmity to Fonseca. Additional biographical material is contained in GÓMARA, *Historia de las Indias* and *Conquista de Méjico*, Madrid, 1852; and GALÍNDEZ CARVAJAL, *Memorial y Registro Breve de los Reyes Católicos*, Madrid, 1878. For documents, the important printed collections are: *Colección de Documentos Inéditos de Indias; Boletín de la Real Academia de Historia;* NAVARRETE, *Colección de Viajes y Descubrimientos*, 5 vols, Madrid, 1858; *Cartas de Hernán Cortés*, Madrid, 1858 (translated by FOLSOM, *Despatches of Cortés*, New York, 1843, and MACNUTT, *Letters of Cortes*, New York, 1908), and DUQUESA DE BERWICK Y ALBA, *Autógrafos de Colón y Papeles de América*, Madrid, 1892.

sketch of the traditional Fonseca that synthesizes all the evil reports we have of him—his haughty bearing, his grasping control of Indian affairs, his perfidious conduct towards Columbus, Las Casas and Cortés, his patronage of all that was evil and his antagonism for all that was good in the exploration and conquest of the New World. Against this picture of Fonseca we must take into account three facts: first, that Fonseca remained at the head of Indian affairs from 1493 until his death, and enjoyed the constant friendship and confidence of Ferdinand and Isabella, and the respect of their successors, Ximénez, Adrian and Charles V; secondly, that occasional references are made by disinterested and trustworthy witnesses, to his high character and merits; and thirdly, that we have no document proving unworthy motives in any of his actions.

Little is known of the early life and training of Fonseca. He came of a distinguished Castilian family, which gave to the Church no fewer than four archbishops and one bishop in the period of America's discovery. His father, Alonso de Fonseca, held the *Senoría* of Coca and Alaejos, an ancestral title that had been in the family for many generations, to which Don Antonio, an older brother of Bishop Juan, succeeded at his father's death in 1505. Don Antonio was Ambassador to the Holy See in 1495,[2] and later held the important post of Comptroller-General of Castile. The family was connected by marriage with some of the most influential nobles of the time, including the families of González de Mendoza, the "Great Cardinal of Spain," and of Henry, Count of Nassau.[3]

Juan Rodríguez de Fonseca must have come early to the attention of Queen Isabella—possibly as a page at Court—for we are informed by Sigüenza[4] that it was she who entrusted his training to the saintly Talavera, her confessor, "in order that in his service he might learn to be a saint;" and Sigüenza adds, in witness to the gratitude of Fonseca: "Although they made him presently Archdeacon of Olmedo, he never wished to leave the service of Talavera, and used to take pride in calling himself his

---

[2] Bernáldez, *op. cit.*, pp. 683–4.
[3] Carvajal, *op. cit.*, pp. 549–50.
[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 319.

servant." And lest the point be lost, it should be noted that Talavera, in spite of his many duties, both of religion and of state, made a specialty of training young men. His first care, when made first Archbishop of Granada in 1492, was to select, for the service of the choir and sanctuary, thirty poor boys, whom he trained and taught in his own house in preparation for Holy Orders. His care for his priests was not less exacting. "He ate with them," says Sigüenza, "and conducted their life as in a monastery."[5] One other detail of the early life of Fonseca is worthy of mention. He was a favorite pupil of Nebrija, the most famous of Spanish humanists,[6] and this leads us to believe that he studied at Salamanca, where Nebrija was teaching at the time, but we have no more positive information about him until his ordination to the subdiaconate.

This event took place in the Cathedral of Barcelona, on Saturday, March 2, 1493, just two days before Columbus sighted land, off Lisbon, on the return from his first voyage. He was ordained under title of Chaplain to the Queen and Canon of the collegiate church of Alfaro, in Tarragona. He was made a deacon shortly afterwards, and five weeks later, on Holy Saturday, April 6, he was ordained to the priesthood in the same cathedral, and made Archdeacon of Seville.[7]

He had already left Barcelona for his new post when Columbus came to that city for his first interview with the Sovereigns after his return. The stay of Columbus at Court was brief. The King and Queen were anxious to organize the exploration of the newly discovered lands as rapidly as possible in order to forestall any action on the part of Portugal, and Columbus was sent off in haste to Seville, with letters to Fonseca, who had been given the duty of fitting out the new expedition. Whether this was the first meeting of the two is not certain, though it hardly seems likely, for Fonseca's patron, Talavera, had long been a friend of Columbus, and Fonseca could easily have met him at the Bishop's house in Avila, or even earlier at Palencia, which apparently was Talavera's first bishopric.[8]

---

[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 302.

[6] CARVAJAL, *op. cit.*, p. 559, n.

[7] FITA, S. J., in the *Boletín*, Vol. xx, p. 178.

[8] *Boletín*, Vol. lvi, p. 154.

The enterprise on which Columbus was now embarking was a vast one, and both he and Fonseca were given wide powers and privileges in order to secure its success. The first royal orders were issued on May 23,[9] and the two commissioners immediately set to work on their preparations. The fiscal officers of the kingdom intervened at this juncture, however, fearing that complications might arise from the ample power given to Columbus and Fonseca, and obtained by royal order the appointment of Juan de Soria as their representative with the fleet, to audit its accounts.[10] This selection proved unfortunate, as Soria gave Columbus frequent cause for complaint, first by opposing some of the contracts made by Columbus, and later by a manipulation of the force that accompanied the fleet, fraudulently substituting men and horses of his own choice for those approved by Columbus. His action brought several royal remonstrances and finally caused his dismissal from the service. Between Columbus and Fonseca, on the other hand, there seems at this time to have been a better understanding, in spite of the fact that their powers overlapped, and that the point of view of the young Castilian noble must have often differed from that of the old Genoese navigator. There was one conflict noted by the Crown, however. Columbus insisted on having a large personal bodyguard, and Fonseca opposed this as unnecessary because, since among the thousand people already enlisted for the enterprise, all under the orders of Columbus, there were certainly enough to take care of the personal wants of the Admiral. Irving says that Fonseca was tacitly reproved for this action, but, on the contrary, we have a royal instruction[11] commending Fonseca for his prudence, and assigning ten squires and twenty servants from among those already enlisted, for the service of Columbus, according to the plan of Fonseca. Irving says further that Fonseca was angered by this supposed reprimand, and purposely delayed the departure of the fleet in order to embarrass Columbus. The real cause of the delay was that the equipment of a fleet of seventeen vessels and a thousand people, for a journey of what then seemed uncon-

---

[9] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxx, pp. 65 *sqq.* and 106 *sqq.*; vol. xxxviii, pp. 135–143, 155–160.
[10] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxx, p. 148.
[11] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxx, pp. 184 *sqq.*

scionable length, and for a permanent settlement in an unknown country, was a feat that taxed to the utmost the resources of Andalucia, which was just recovering from the disturbances of the preceding year, when the Moors were finally driven from its borders. There were frequent royal protests against the delay that would send the vessels out in face of the storms of fall and winter, and yet in spite of this, the Sovereigns themselves, on September 5,[12] changed the destination of five of the ships prepared for Columbus, to form a fleet to convey back to Africa Muley Boabdil, the last Moorish King of Granada. Finally, in spite of vexatious delays, the fleet of Columbus got under way, and Fonseca was given a period of rest before the next arrival of news from the Indies.

This respite was brief, however, for on February 2, 1494, Columbus started Antonio de Torres back to Spain with twelve ships, to give a report on the journey and to requisition new supplies for the colony. Torres reached Cádiz in March, and Fonseca immediately reported his arrival to the Sovereigns, who ordered him to send on at once the letters of Columbus. In his desire to establish order in the affairs of the Indies, Fonseca caused some complaint among the members of the armada at this time, by anticipating modern port regulations.[13] Columbus had sent back some gold received from the Indians, and Fonseca allowed no one to land until he had taken charge of it for the Royal Treasury. This action, though distasteful at the time, fixed the precedent for all succeeding importations of gold from the Indies. The ships were promptly discharged, however, and Fonseca stood ready for further orders from the Sovereigns.

On April 7, a royal order was dispatched commanding him to send at once to the Indies four vessels with colonists and explorers, and to supply them with the necessaries of life. It was at first the royal intention to send these four ships at once and a fuller armada later, but the Sovereigns delayed for a fuller study of the *Memorandum* sent by de Torres. This delay proved disastrous to the colony, and was the cause of many of the later troubles of Columbus. Many of the provisions had been spoiled by lack of

---

[12] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxx, pp. 16 *sqq.*

[13] Bernáldez, *op. cit.*, 668.

care, and the *biscocho*, or hard-tack (the staple that had been most difficult to procure in Andalucia the year before), had given out. However, the urgent needs of the colonists were not realized in Spain, and time wore on as preparations were made for a larger fleet. Difficulties next arose as to the ships to be pressed into the royal service, and this matter was no sooner settled than the scarcity of wheat in Andalucia caused a royal embargo to be placed on its exportation.[14] Unfortunately, Count Cinfuentes, the royal governor of Seville, understood this embargo to include the relief armada, and with winter approaching it seemed that the fleet would never get under way. Another conflicting order[15] came to Fonseca at this time (September 5, 1494), commanding that eight vessels should be sent at once instead of four, and that five more caravels should follow later. Three days later this order was rescinded and Fonseca ordered to send off the original four ships, since more could not be financed until the fall catch of *atún* was sold.[16] The desires of the Sovereigns were beyond their means, and the whole month of September was spent in correspondence about the size of the fleet. It was finally decided to send only four ships, and with a peremptory order to Cinfuentes to suspend the embargo on wheat, the fleet was released and sent on its way about the middle of October.

Little more than a month elapsed before word reached Spain of the extreme distress of the little colony in Española [Hayti]. On December 13, the Sovereigns wrote to Fonseca, acknowledging his report on having heard from Columbus, and ordering him to send another armada back at once. This tentative order was held in abeyance, however, pending the arrival at Court of Margarita and Father Boil, who had come to complain about the administration of Columbus. Fonseca, too, was called away from his duties at this time to be consecrated Bishop, an office bestowed in recognition of his signal service to the Crown. The "Great Cardinal of Spain," Mendoza, had just died, and his bishopric of Sigüenza, the richest in Spain, was given to Carvajal, who later attained unpleasant fame as the leader of the schis-

[14] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxxviii, p. 390.
[15] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxx, p. 286.
[16] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxxviii, p. 398.

matical Cardinals of the Council of Pisa (1511), while Fonseca was nominated for the bishopric of Badajoz, vacated by Carvajal. During his absence, Fonseca left affairs in the hands of Jimeno de Bribiesca, who was later to be distinguished by receiving a personal chastisement from Columbus, when the latter was about to sail on his third voyage. Bribiesca busied himself with preparations while the Court was discussing the case of Columbus, and succeeded in settling with Cinfuentes the vexed question of the bread supply for the colony in Española.[17]

Fonseca soon returned to Seville and resumed charge of affairs. The Court, influenced by the unfavorable report of Margarita and Boil on the Columbus administration, now resolved to send Diego de Carillo with power to investigate the adverse charges, and Fonseca was ordered to place the four vessels under Carillo's command. Another possibility was provided for: the royal order stated that in case Columbus had died, Carillo should take his place.[18] These proceedings were interrupted abruptly, however, by the arrival, in April, of Antonio de Torres with news from Columbus; and Aguado, who had shown himself friendly to Columbus, was now substituted for Carillo in charge of the fleet.[19] Although the Sovereigns ordered Fonseca to send off the fleet at once in spite of the change in command, he held it pending the arrival of Torres at Court, and once the report of Torres was made, so many complications ensued that the ships did not finally sail before June.

It is interesting to note here that Torres brought back with him on this ship the first consignment of Indians to be sold as slaves in Spain.[20] On April 12, 1495, Fonseca was ordered to sell these Indians in Andalucia,[21] and on the following day another dispatch was issued telling him to hold the money received from the sale until theologians could satisfy the royal conscience regarding the morality of this act.[22] This is interesting in view of the large slave-holdings later enjoyed by Fonseca.

---

[17] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxx, pp. 327–29.

[18] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxxviii, p. 329.

[19] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxx, p. 349; vol. xxxviii, p. 334.

[20] Those brought on the first voyage were intended for "purposes of demonstration."

[21] NAVARRETE, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 189; *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxx, p. 332.

[22] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxx, p. 335; vol. xxxviii, p. 342.

It is at this time, too, that we find the first indication of any conflict between Columbus and Fonseca. Columbus had suggested, it is true, in the de Torres *Memorandum* of the year previous, that perhaps he should "complain of someone higher up," in the matter of defective supplies, but no open or definite complaint seems to have been made to the Crown until Diego Columbus, the younger brother of Christopher, found occasion to object to the fiscal regulations of Fonseca, when he returned with de Torres from the New World. Diego had brought with him some gold, and Fonseca claimed it for the Crown, according to the regulations of the preceding year. Diego objected to this and carried the matter to Court, where he made the most of his opportunity to state his case against Fonseca. This drew forth a royal command for Fonseca to return to Diego the gold he had taken, to "speak to him and try to satisfy him," and to write to Columbus and try to overcome his resentment by finding out what he could do to please him.[23]

The letters containing these commands are most interesting in the light of contemporary and subsequent events. With the representations that had been made, the Sovereigns had ample reason to be vexed at the conduct of Columbus, yet they were always careful not to wound his feelings. On the first of June, they addressed him several personal letters, mildly remonstrating against his severe measures, forbidding him to take away the rations of the colonists as a punishment,[24] and ordering him to return to Spain any colonists who were dissatisfied with their lot. This conciliatory attitude towards Columbus on the part of the Sovereigns was characteristic of their dealings with him, and that it was imitated by Fonseca is clear from later events.

After the departure of Aguado and his fleet in June, 1495, nothing more was heard from the Indies for a year, when Aguado brought Columbus back to Spain for a trial of the charges against him. That Columbus considered Fonseca as an enemy at this time is quite untenable, for we find the two of them sojourning quite happily under the roof of their mutual friend, Padre

---

[23] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxx, pp. 350–355; NAVARRETE, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 196.

[24] Las Casas says that Oviedo is in error when he says that Columbus deprived Father Boil and others of rations. *Hist.*, t. ii, p. 118.

Bernáldez, the gossipy *Cura de los Palacios*.[25] And that Columbus was not sent back to America immediately is not to be attributed to any intrigue of Fonseca,[26] nor is there any necessity for supposing a plot in Spain for the overthrow of the Admiral. The reports from Española had convinced the Sovereigns that Columbus was not in sympathy with the Spanish temperament, and they thought it best for his own interests, as well as for the colony in Española, that he have no part in the administration there.

When permission was finally given, the following year (1497) for Columbus to make a third voyage of exploration, Fonseca did everything in his power to expedite matters for him. It is in connection with these preparations that Ferdinand, the son and historian of Columbus, and a decided enemy of Fonseca, makes his only specific charge against him. He says that out of enmity to Columbus, Fonseca purposely delayed the preparations for this voyage. This charge has been repeated by most historians, although, strangely enough, Las Casas, who usually takes every opportunity to condemn Fonseca, attributes the delay to others "who hindered Columbus and Fonseca."[27] And this is shown by documents to have been the real cause for the delay. First, there was the usual lack of money, as we see by two royal orders, dated October 9, 1497, to certain merchants, to pay Columbus and Fonseca for the wheat bought from them, as they need the money for fitting out the armada;[28] and secondly, there was more than the usual trouble about provisions. A royal letter of December 23,[29] acknowledges that both Columbus and Fonseca have reported that the cause of the delay was the unreasonable attitude of the merchants of Andalucia in charging exorbitant prices for everything, and also gives them authority to select agents and to fix reasonable prices. This decisive action of the Crown finally overcame the obstacles in the way of Columbus, and some three weeks later he sailed on his third voyage. That

[25] BERNÁLDEZ, *op. cit.*, p. 678.

[26] BERNÁLDEZ, *loc. cit.*, says that Columbus was detained in Spain by "the necessities of the French War."

[27] *Op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 199.

[28] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxxviii, pp. 394, 396.

[29] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxxvi, p. 182.

the delay had irritated Columbus there can be no doubt. On the eve of his departure, according to Las Casas, he gave Bribiesca a place in history by throwing him to the ground and kicking him. That this action was resented by Fonseca may naturally be supposed, and we would have reason to suspect a like resentment on the part of the Sovereigns, a measure of whose authority Bribiesca represented, but we cannot find that any future action of theirs gave evidence of such resentment.

Shortly after the departure of Columbus, preparations were made for other voyages of exploration, and that same year (1498) Niño, Guerra and Ojeda started for the New World. Columbus looked upon such expeditions as an infringement of his rights, and Las Casas makes a special case against Fonseca in the matter of Ojeda's commission. This, he says, was signed by Fonseca alone, whether on his own initiative or under authority from the Crown he did not know, but to his mind it was a plot of Fonseca's to ruin Columbus.[30] Herrera[31] was, likewise, puzzled at finding Ojeda's commission signed by Fonseca, and historians since their time have followed Las Casas in considering this an act of treachery. Fernández Duro has pointed out[32] that there can be no question here of either treachery or unjustified assumption of power by Fonseca, for such an action could not have taken place without the knowledge of the Sovereigns, who must have authorized it. As a matter of fact, the Crown, without wishing to detract from either the glory or the gratitude due to Columbus, had ceased to regard the exploration of the Indies as a "one-man affair." Spain was in urgent need of money and it was expedient —as they stated to Columbus with every message urging haste— that the new country should be explored and its possession established as soon as possible, to forestall any action on the part of their powerful rivals. They did not want to violate any right of Columbus, but if there was any injury it was on the part of the Sovereigns and not of Fonseca. Two years later, when Ojeda applied for a second commission, they granted it with pleasure,[33]

---

[30] *Hist.*, t. ii, pp. 389–90.
[31] Dec. i, lib. iv, cap. 3.
[32] *Amigos y Enemigos de Colón*, p. 18.
[33] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxxviii, pp. 468 *sqq.*

and gave no intimation that the first expedition had been without their approval. From this time on, in fact, commissions to explore were freely given to all who could offer the proper guarantees, with the restriction that they were not to conflict with commissions previously granted. And that there was nothing irregular in the signature of Fonseca to the commission of Ojeda seems plain from the fact that the several commissions we have, dating from 1500, follow the same plan.[34]

The strange statement is made by historians, on the authority of Las Casas, that Fonseca was deprived of his office for a time during the years 1497–98. There are documents enough to show his activity during this period, but if there were not, the statement of these historians would refute their own charges concerning the delay in the third voyage and the commission of Ojeda. As a matter of fact, Fonseca was constantly rising in the royal favor. In 1499 he was nominated to the vacant bishopric of Córdoba, and in September of that year he was sent as Ambassador to Flanders to arrange for the marriage of the Princess Margarita, widow of the late heir-apparent, Don Juan, to the Duke of Savoy. It is possible that Las Casas may have heard of this or some other absence of Fonseca, and concluded that he was dismissed from the royal service.

The affairs of the Indies ran along smoothly for an extended period now, so far as Fonseca was concerned. The *Casa de Contratación* had developed under his direction so that he was now freed from much of the merely routine work. There were many commissions to make out, fleets to inspect, Indians to be distributed, sold, or sent back to America, as the royal favor turned for or against their slavery, but there seems to have been no serious interruption of the routine until Columbus returned in chains from his third voyage (1501). Even in the sending of Bobadilla to Española to investigate the charges against Columbus, Fonseca seems to have had no more than a perfunctory part.[35]

---

[34] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxxviii, pp. 441, 449, 451, 453. *Cf.* also *ibid.*, Vol. xxxviii, p. 459—a memorandum of letters sent Columbus, in which he is informed that no one is to go to the Indies without the permission of the Sovereigns *or* the person authorized in Cádiz.

[35] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxxviii, pp. 409–431.

The arrival of Columbus in chains caused quite a sensation in Seville and at the Court. Columbus came with many complaints, and not the least of them, apparently, was the matter of Ojeda's commission. The Queen was full of sympathy and did not want to see him wronged, but neither did she want him to hold any resentment against her royal chaplain, Fonseca; so she offered, Columbus says in a letter,[36] to act as intermediary for their differences. Whether this resentment was anything more serious than a suspicion that Fonseca had favored Ojeda at his expense we do not know, but it is certain that the two were on agreeable terms a few years later, when Columbus wrote (January 18, 1505) to his son Diego: "If the Bishop of Palencia is arrived, or when he does come, tell him how much I rejoice in his prosperity, and that if I go there [to Segovia] I will stop with him at his house whether he wishes it or not, for we ought to return to our first brotherly affection." "This," says Thacher, whose translation is quoted, "is the language of pleasantry to an old friend, not such a message as would be sent to a bitter enemy who for thirteen years had persecuted him and thwarted or delayed most of his plans."[37] This is the last documentary reference we have to the relations between Columbus and Fonseca, and it can hardly justify us in picturing the latter as hounded to his grave by a cold-blooded and unforgiving enemy.

We have just seen Fonseca referred to as Bishop of Palencia. This dignity came to him on the death, late in 1504, of Cardinal Zúñiga, Archbishop of Seville. Diego de Deza, an old friend of Columbus, went from Palencia to take the place of Zúñiga, and Fonseca was advanced to the latter see. He was in Flanders at the time, on a message from Ferdinand to his daughter Juana, who had been associated with him in the government since the death of Isabella (November 26, 1504). Shortly after this he

[36] *May 24, 1501.* THACHER, *Columbus*, Vol. iii, pp. 159–163.

[37] *Op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 550. This message is preceeded in the *Book of Privileges* by several other letters to Diego referring to the "Bishop of Palencia." Thacher refers them all to Fonseca, but the first, dated November 21, in which Columbus says "the Lord Bishop of Palencia wishes to honor me," is said by Sánchez Moguel to refer neither to Deza, the retiring Bishop, nor to the new incumbent, Fonseca, but to Talavera, who was Bishop of Palencia when the project of Columbus was first examined by the scholars of the realm, before the first voyage. See his article in the *Boletín de la Real Academia de Historia*, Vol. lvi, p. 154.

was called home to perform the last rites for his father, who was laid to rest in the ancestral tomb at Coca.

Historians who follow Herrera and Las Casas bring next before us a supposed conflict between Fonseca and Diego, the son and heir of Columbus. Diego went to Española as governor on the recall of Ovando, in 1509, and was in command there, at intervals, for some fourteen years. He made frequent trips to Spain, to answer the charges made against his administration and to secure his claims to hereditary rights which had been infringed by various royal appointments. That Fonseca was concerned in the charges against him is shown by a letter[38] to him from the Duke of Alba, whose niece Diego had married, in which the Bishop is charged with opposing the suit of Diego. However, that this opposition was anything more than an official act of prosecution seems unlikely, for Duro says, on the authority of Garibay, that when Diego and the Duke of Alba could obtain nothing, pending the settlement of the suit, Fonseca and the secretary of his Council, Conchillos, obtained for Diego the government of the Indies.[39] Diego was naturally jealous of the privileges which he saw slipping away from him with the growth of the enterprise of the Indies; every new appointment called forth a protest from him, so that we even find him aligned against both the friends and enemies of Fonseca in the famous case of Cortés against Velásquez for the government of Mexico, in an appeal to the Emperor to dismiss the claims of both, as in conflict with his own.[40] Fonseca, on the other hand, stood for a progressive development of the colonies under properly established authority, and it was natural that his plans should often be in conflict with the ambitions of Diego.

Fonseca meanwhile had risen to the zenith of his power. His work was well organized at Seville, and he was frequently called upon by Ferdinand, to whose royal chapel he had been attached,

---

[38] Published in 1892 by the Duquesa de Berwick y Alba: *Autógrafos de Colón y Papeles de América*. Cf. *Boletín*, Vol. xxv, p. 405.

[39] Duro, *op. cit.*, p. 19. The commission of Diego, with the signatures of Ferdinand and Fonseca is given in Navarrete, Vol. ii, p. 406.

[40] *Boletín*, Vol. xxv, p. 409. Cortés told the Emperor in the Garay case that he knew that Garay was supported by Diego Columbus, Fonseca and Velásquez. *Cartas de Cortés*, p. 103.

for business of state not concerned with America. Thus we find him, in May, 1511, royal commissioner in the affairs of the English army hired by Ferdinand for the suppression of the schism of Carvajal and the taking of Bologna.[41] In 1512 he was advanced from Palencia to the see of Burgos, and probably in that same year he was made Archbishop of Rosano, when Cardinal Carvajal was excommunicated and deprived of his benefices. Finally, on July 26, 1513, King Ferdinand asked for his appointment as Patriarch of the Indies. In his letter to Gerónimo de Vich, Ambassador to the Holy See, the king refers to him as "of illustrious birth, one of the principal nobles of this kingdom, who has from the beginning been encharged with the affairs of the Indies, and has by his disinterested industry and vigilance, diligence and care, . . . been the very principal cause of much good accomplished there, and continues his labors with great zeal to the end that all those peoples may be converted to Our Lord."[42] In spite of the instances of Ferdinand, however, Pope Leo X did not consider it advisable to create in the West a great ecclesiastical power like the Eastern centralizations that had caused so much damage to the Church, and the matter was held in reserve.[43] With Fonseca's rise in power came a corresponding increase in influence and wealth. As President of the *Consejo de Indias* and head of the *Casa de Contratación*, he received many royal grants of lands and Indians, and he is mentioned as one of the largest holders of Indian slaves under the system of *repartimientos*. The question of the justice of this system had been agitated time and again during these first years by friars and governors, and it had been provisionally adopted as the best working plan for civilizing the Indians and bringing them to Christianity. This was the state of affairs when Las Casas, who had but recently changed his views and given up his slaves, appeared in Spain with proposals of relief for the Indians. News of his views and radical utterances had reached Spain ahead of him, for the authorities in Española, fearing the destruc-

[41] BERNÁLDEZ, *op. cit.*, p. 744.

[42] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxxix, p. 264. NAVARRETE, Vol. ii, p. 390.

[43] The Patriarchate was not established until 1524, under Clement VII, when Don Antonio de Rojas, Archbishop of Granada, was given the honorary title of Patriarch of the Indies. Cf. *Boletín*, Vol. vii, p. 197.

tion of their sources of revenue, were anxious to forestall any revolutionary change. In view of this condition, the first representations of Las Casas to Fonseca were not received with any degree of enthusiasm. Angered at his cool reception, Las Casas made use of the division of powers and sympathies that came with the death of Ferdinand and the accession of Charles V (1516). He obtained the approval of Ximénez, the regent, for his first plan for an investigation and for his later projects for the introduction of Castilian and negro laborers, and for his peaceful conquest of Cumaná with the "Knights of the Golden Spur." For these later projects he also enlisted the aid of the Flemish advisers whom the new Emperor, Charles V, had introduced into Spanish affairs, and with the support of these powers he felt free from any dependence on Fonseca—so free, in fact, that he even disregarded the approval of Fonseca's Council given to his second scheme, and went directly to Ximénez and the *Flamencos*. Naturally, such action did not tend to heal the breach between the two. Many sharp repartees passed between them, and, knowing as we do the tendency of Las Casas to judge everything by its relation to the object of his zealous prepossession, we can see how his own view of Fonseca has colored his narrative of the latter's dealings with Columbus. No doubt both were honest in their views, but Fonseca saw in the plans of Las Casas the subversion of the order he had built up on what he considered the best advices received from the New World, and he was not prepared to sacrifice his personal interests and those of his countrymen for what he considered the idealizations of an obsession. Towards the end, their relations grew more friendly, however, as the plans of Las Casas matured and appeared more feasible; but there never was a perfect understanding between the two, and it is to this disagreement, more than anything else, that we can trace Fonseca's bad name in history.

But if Fonseca's dealings with Las Casas were unfortunate, his relations with Cortés were tragic, and brought no little trouble to the closing years of his life. Bernal Diaz del Castillo, the camp-fire Boswell of Cortés, gives at great length the story of the conflict between the Conquistador of Mexico and the Bishop of Burgos, and roundly accuses the latter of using all his

influence for the destruction of the enterprise; and yet he begins his story with the frank admission that it was all the result of a misunderstanding.[44]

The story of the conquest of Mexico has been popularized by Prescott, but a few of its salient features need to be set forth briefly to explain the opposition of Fonseca to it. After the first discovery and reconnaisance of Mexico by the expeditions of Hernández de Córdoba and Grijalva, Diego de Velásquez, governor of Cuba, determined to send a larger expedition to explore this promising country. He enlisted Cortés in the expedition, and placed him in command of the eleven ships that were prepared. However, before the fleet sailed, he grew suspicious of the daring young Castilian and sent to remove him from command, but Cortés anticipated his action by sailing away at once. Velásquez immediately denounced his action to the *Casa de Contratación* as insubordination, and won his point by gaining the good will of Fonseca before Cortés had an opportunity to explain his action. Cortés knew of the friendly relations that existed between Fonseca and Velásquez, and he determined to offset this by making a good impression on the Emperor,[45] and thus obtain recognition directly from him. To this end he pushed his conquest as rapidly as possible, and sent commissioners to Spain with large presents of gold, and letters to the Emperor asking for a royal commission to rule the land he had occupied. Unfortunately for him, the Emperor was in Flanders when his first commission arrived, and the delegates were met by Fonseca. In his official capacity he took charge of the letters and gold for the Emperor, and if he had had reasons of state before for being opposed to Cortés, he now had very personal reasons to be much more so, for among the messages was one from the troops of Cortés, which denounced Fonseca to the Emperor in severe terms and stated that the reason for his opposition was that Velásquez had given him "a town of Indians in Cuba, while he had given no Indians to the Emperor."[46] Fonseca had every reason to suspect what we know to have been the case, namely,

[44] "Supimos por muy cierto que nos andaba por destruir, y todo por ser mal informado." *Conquista de Nueva España*, ch. 43.

[45] Diaz, *op. cit.*, ch. 17.

[46] *Op. cit.*, ch. 54.

that Cortés spread this idea among his troops and approved their letter. Cortés said later in a letter[47] to the Emperor that in order to maintain loyalty among his troops he had told them to disregard the threats of Fonseca, who was moved by personal interests, and Bernal Diaz says that Cortés read the letter of the soldiers to the Emperor and was pleased with it.[48]

Fonseca's action was prompt and decisive. He conferred with the agent of Velásquez, Padre Benito Martínez, who happened to be at Court at the time, and was informed that the representations of Cortés were false. He then arrested one of the commissioners, Puertocarrero, who was charged with abducting a girl and taking her to the Indies two years before, and sent to the Emperor a report favorable to Velásquez and opposed to Cortés. Meanwhile Velásquez had incurred the wrath of the Royal Audiencia at Santo Domingo, by contemning their authority. Against their veto he sent Narvaez with an expedition of seventeen ships against Cortés. Narvaez was outwitted by Cortés and disarmed. The same thing happened to the two officials, Tapia and Bono de Quexo, sent later under authority of Fonseca, and when Cortés learned that he had gained the Audiencia through the foolhardiness of Velásquez, he pushed his case before the Emperor. He sent commissioners with magnificent presents on two succeeding occasions, and when these delegates met with the opposition to Fonseca, they went over his head and brought suit before Adrian of Utrecht, who, though recently elected Pope, was still residing in Spain as Regent. Adrian heard the arguments of both sides and decided against Fonseca, who was thenceforth to have no jurisdiction in the matters of Cortés. The charge was made, and apparently proved, that Fonseca had an additional personal reason for favoring Velásquez, in that he was trying to arrange a marriage between that official and a niece of his own, Doña Petronila de Fonseca; but the claim that Fonseca had kept for himself the gold sent to Charles does not seem to have been established, for neither the decision of Adrian nor the later judgment of Charles had any clause demanding restitution.

---

[47] *Cartas de Cortés*, p. 99.

[48] *Op. cit.*, ch. 54.

Charles V returned from Flanders shortly afterwards, and approved the sentence of Adrian. Bernal Diaz says that Fonseca, "in rage and mortification," retired to his estates at Toro. Here he was sought out by a number of the enemies of Cortés, who had gathered in Spain to make common cause against him. There was Narvaez, whose ambition Cortés had disarmed; Umbria, whose feet had been cut off by command of Cortés for insubordination;[49] and Cárdenas, whose grievance was that the action of Cortés in sending as much gold as possible to the Emperor left the soldiers with insufficient reward for their hardships and labors in the conquest.[50] Fonseca headed this delegation to the Emperor, and presented a long series of charges, in which it was maintained that the expedition of Cortés, which began with an act of insubordination, had been marked by a series of depredations in contempt of all authority. Charles ordered another investigation and named, as commissioners of the trial, the Italian Grand Chancellor, with three Castilian and two Flemish judges. The result of the trial, as far as Fonseca was concerned, was the same as before: the wrongs of Cárdenas and Umbria were redressed, the case of Narvaez was reserved, Velásquez was reprimanded for having treated with Fonseca alone instead of with the Emperor, and the withdrawal of Cortés from the jurisdiction of Fonseca was confirmed.

Still another attempt was made by Fonseca to attain what he considered his rights against Cortés. Rodrigo de Albornoz came to Fonseca with a new set of charges against Cortés, and was recommended to the Emperor by the Bishop. That Charles had not lost faith in Fonseca's judgment is shown by his statement on this occasion: "I will have to punish Cortés for all the evil they tell of him, in spite of all the gold he sends, for justice is worth more than all the treasure he can command."[51] There was a long delay, however, before the investigation was begun in Mexico, and the Bishop of Burgos went to his grave without the satisfaction of proving his case against the Conquistador of Mexico.

---

[49] *Ibid.*, ch. 102.
[50] *Ibid.*, ch. 105.
[51] *Ibid.*, ch. 172.

Fonseca had been ailing for some time before, and no doubt his irritation at the charges made against him by Las Casas and Cortés was partly influenced by his physical condition. We have one letter from him in which he begs to be excused from coming to Court, because of a sudden attack which affected his stomach and lungs. It is dated from Burgos, August 11, 1517, and begins with the naïve acknowledgment: "Your Majesty's letter was handed to me yesterday, Monday, the feast of St. Lawrence, while I was at Mass. . . ."[52] The state of his health and the uncomfortable times he had been through made him less active in Indian affairs, though it is not true, as Bernal Diaz and others assert, that he was deprived of his office by Charles V. In fact we have an official letter[53] from him to the Emperor, dated November 12, 1523, the day before the date assigned by Fernández Duro for his death.[54] It reports that the officials at Seville have advised him of the arrival of Don Diego Columbus at San Lucar de Barrameda, and that Fray Pedro Melgarejo has brought gold that was not registered; and this proves conclusively that he was quite active up to the last.[55] There has been considerable discussion as to the time of his death,[56] but it is certain that he died within a little more than a year after the second decision against him, signed by Charles, October 22, 1522.[57]

For a full judgment of the merits and failings of Fonseca,

---

[52] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xxxvi, p. 527.

[53] *Doc. inéd.*, Vol. xl, p. 153.

[54] *Boletín*, Vol. vii, p. 203.

[55] Diaz and Gomara seem equally unjustified in saying that Fonseca had a serious quarrel with his nephew (cousin?), Alonso de Fonseca, over the succession to the Archbishopric of Santiago, which they say the latter had obtained by furnishing money for the recovery from France of Fuente Rabia, in Navarre. Alonso received this benefice in trust, in 1507, on the resignation of his predecessor, who died five years later; but he never occupied the see, for when he came of age to receive it the see of Toledo was made vacant by the sudden death of Croy, the immediate successor of Ximénez, and Alonso took that see by preference. Tavera was made Archbishop of Santiago. CARVAJAL, *op. cit.*, pp. 556 *sqq.* Cf. also GARIBAY, *Los Quarenta libros del Compendio historial de las Chronicas y universal Historia de todos los Reynos de España.* Barcelona, 1628, lib. xx.

[56] Irving places it as late as 1554, and this, in view of another conjecture as to the date of his birth, 1451, would have made him 103 years of age at his death—a noble age for a choleric man!

[57] SOLÍS, *Conq. de Méjico*, p. 356. Bernal Diaz says May 17.

we must await a fuller search by Spanish scholars into the more personal records of his life, but that he has been grossly misjudged by historians there can be no doubt. He was a wise, constructive statesman, and bore the brunt of Spanish colonial organization. He stood between the extravagant dreams of both Sovereigns and discoverers, and the limited means of the Spanish treasury, that had to wait for the sale of the fall catch of *atún* to equip a fleet. This constant need of money made him favor expeditions that promised large returns, to the apparent injury of the monopolistic rights granted to Columbus and his son. The project of Las Casas seemed to him economically inexpedient, and in the case of Cortés he allowed himself to be carried away by the representations of Velásquez that Cortés was a rebel. That "he was more given to equipping fleets than to saying Pontifical Masses," as Las Casas sharply said of him, need not surprise us. Those were the days of Court Bishops, when holy men like Talavera and Ximénez considered that they could advance God's interests by giving good advice to kings as well as by remaining at home with their flocks; and it must be said of Fonseca that he saw more of the water-front in Cádiz than of the luxury of Court. He was a Castilian of the Castilians, proud without a doubt, resentful, too, like the rest of his race, of the ascendancy of Flemish advisers in the Court of Charles, and his practical autonomy during the last years of Ferdinand probably made him exceed his powers later; but that he was a vindictive and unforgiving enemy, or that he stooped to vile and underhand means to accomplish his end, there is not a shred of a document to prove.

JOHN F. O'HARA, C.S.C.
University of Notre Dame,
Indiana.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY

XII. THE PROVINCE OF CHICAGO (1843-1880[1])

The Province of Chicago was established, September 10, 1880, by Pope Leo XIII and covers the same territory as the original Diocese, *i. e.*, the whole State of Illinois. The Suffragan Sees are Alton, erected 1853; Peoria, 1877; Belleville, 1887; and Rockford, 1908.

1. CHICAGO (1843)

"Any historical sketch of the Archdiocese of Chicago, no matter how brief, must commence with the name of the intrepid Jesuit missionary, James Marquette, who on the twenty-fifth of October, 1674, set out with two attendants from the station of St. Francis Xavier on Green Bay, to found a mission on the Illinois River. He reached the mouth of the Chicago River on the fourth of December and built a cabin, the first white habitation, it would appear, on the site of the city of Chicago."[2]

He was followed by other French missionaries, and after 1804, when Fort Dearborn was erected and attracted the Catholic pioneers, other priests came from time to time to minister to them. Father Gabriel Richard preached at the fort in 1821 and Father Badin, the proto-priest of the United States, administered baptism there in 1822 to Alexander Beaubien. But it was only in 1833 that Bishop Rosati of St. Louis, acting as Vicar General of Bardstown, sent a resident pastor in the person of the Rev. John Mary Ignatius St. Cyr. Father St. Cyr said the first Mass in Chicago, May 5, 1833, and shortly afterwards erected a small church which was dedicated in October of the same year. A little later when Bishop Brute, the first Bishop of Vincennes, came to Chicago he found a congregation of about four hundred souls. The State of Illinois was a part of the Diocese of Bardstown, although, in fact, it was attended from the more thriving church of Missouri. When the Diocese of Vincennes was established, eastern Illinois was made a part of it. The Diocese of Chicago

[1] With this issue the series of articles on the *Rise of the Hierarchy in the United States* is concluded.

[2] Article *Chicago* in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*.

was erected by Pope Gregory XVI, November 28, 1843, and comprised the whole State of Illinois. At the present time it includes six counties, with an area of 3,620 square miles, and has 846 priests, 331 churches with resident priests of which 222 are in the city of Chicago, 69 missions and chapels, and a Catholic population of 1,150,000.

1. The first Bishop of Chicago was the Right Rev. **William Quarter,** born at Killurine, King's County, Ireland, January 21, 1806. He came to America in 1822 and was ordained at New York, September 19, 1829. He was consecrated, March 10, 1844, and died, April 10, 1848, aged 42 years.

2. The second Bishop was the Right Rev. **James O. Vandevelde,** born in Belgium, April 3, 1795. He became a Jesuit in 1817 and was ordained at Baltimore, September 25, 1827. He was consecrated, February 11, 1849, was transferred to Natchez, July 29, 1853, and died, November 13, 1855.

3. The Right Rev. **Anthony O'Regan,** born in County Mayo, Ireland, in 1809, was ordained at Maynooth and came to St. Louis in 1849. He was consecrated, July 25, 1854. He resigned and was made titular Bishop of Dora, June 25, 1858. He died in London, England, November 13, 1866, at the age of 57 years.

4. The Right Rev. **James Duggan** was born at Maynooth, County Kildare, Ireland, May 22, 1825, and was ordained at St. Louis, May 29, 1847. He was twice Administrator of the Diocese of Chicago whilst the See was vacant. He was consecrated titular Bishop of Gabala and Coadjutor of St. Louis, May 3, 1857, and was transferred to Chicago, January 21, 1859. On account of infirm health he was removed in 1870, and did not die until March 27, 1899.

5. The Right Rev. **Thomas Foley,** born at Baltimore, March 6, 1822, and ordained, August 16, 1846, was made titular Bishop of Pergamus and Coadjutor of Chicago, November 19, 1869, and was consecrated, February 27, 1870. He was at the same time appointed Administrator of the Diocese. He did not, however, actually enjoy the title of Bishop of Chicago. He died, February 19, 1879.

6. Pope Leo XIII, September 10, 1880, erected the Archdiocese of Chicago, and the Right Rev. **Patrick Augustine Feehan** was translated from Nashville and became the first Archbishop. Archbishop Feehan was born at Spring Hill, County Tipperary, Ireland, August 29 1829, was ordained at St. Louis, November 1, 1852; and was consecrated Bishop of Nashville, November 1, 1865. He died July 12, 1902.

7. The Most Rev. **James Edward Quigley** was born in Canada, October 15, 1855, and was ordained at Rome, April 13, 1879. He was consecrated Bishop of Buffalo, February 24, 1897, and was transferred to Chicago, January 8, 1903. He died, July 10, 1915.

The Right Rev. **Alexander J. McGavick,** titular Bishop of Marcopolis, consecrated May 1, 1899, is Auxiliary of Chicago. The Most Rev. Joseph Weber, titular Archbishop of Darna, consecrated December 2, 1895, Provincial of the Resurrectionist Fathers in the United States, also resides in Chicago.

8. The present Archbishop is the Most Rev. **George W. Mundelein,** born, July 2, 1872, and ordained, June 9, 1895. He was appointed titular bishop of Loryma and Auxiliary of Brooklyn, June 30, 1909, and was consecrated, September 21, 1909. He was promoted and translated to Chicago, December 9, 1915.

2. ALTON (1853-1857)

The Diocese of Chicago was divided by Pope Pius IX, July 29, 1853, and the southern part of the State of Illinois was erected into a Diocese with its See at Quincy. The Very Rev. Joseph Melcher, Vicar General of St. Louis, was chosen as the first bishop, but he declined the appointment and the diocese was never actually organized. It was left under the care and administration of the Bishop of Chicago and finally was removed to Alton, January 9, 1857. Originally, it comprised the whole southern half of Illinois. It comprises 15,139 square miles of territory stretching across the State between Peoria on the north and Belleville on the south, and it has, in 1917, 198 priests, 161 churches, 20 chapels and stations, with a Catholic population of 87,000.

1. The first Bishop of Alton was the Right Rev. **Henry Damian Juncker,** born in Lorraine, August 22, 1809, and ordained at Cincinnati, March 16, 1834. He was consecrated Bishop of Alton, April 26, 1857, and died, October 2, 1868.

2. The second Bishop was the Right Rev. **Peter Joseph Baltes,** born, April 7, 1827, at Ensheim, Bavaria, and ordained at Montreal, May 21, 1853. He was consecrated, January 23, 1870, and died, February 15, 1886.

3. The present Bishop is the Right Rev. **James Ryan,** born at Thurles, County Tipperary, Ireland, June 17, 1848, and ordained at Louisville, Ky., December 24, 1871. He was appointed, February 28, 1888, and was consecrated, May 1, 1888.

3. PEORIA (1877)

The southern portion of the Diocese of Chicago, as it then existed, was erected into the Diocese of Peoria by Pope Pius IX, January 18, 1875. It has an area of 18,554 square miles and has, in 1917, 223 priests, 233 churches, 20 stations, and a Catholic population of 115,550.

1. The first Bishop[3] was the Most Rev. **John Lancaster Spalding,** born in Kentucky, June 2, 1840, and ordained, December 19, 1863. He was appointed, November 27, 1876, and was consecrated, May 1, 1877. He resigned, Septem-

[3] The Rev. Michael Hurley was at first chosen, but he declined. He died as Vicar General of the Diocese in 1898.

ber 11, 1908, and was made titular Archbishop of Scitopolis, October 14, 1908. He died, August 25, 1916.

2. The present Bishop is the Right Rev. **Edmund Michael Dunne**, born at Chicago, February 2, 1864, and ordained at Louvain, June 24, 1887. He was appointed, June 30, 1909, and was consecrated, September 1, 1909.

The Right Rev. **Peter J. O'Reilly**, consecrated titular Bishop of Lebedos, September 21, 1900, is Auxiliary Bishop of Peoria.

4. BELLEVILLE (1887)

The extreme southern part of Illinois was cut off from the Diocese of Alton and erected into the Diocese of Belleville, January 7, 1887, by Pope Leo XIII. It has an area of 11,678 square miles and has, in 1917, 133 priests, 130 churches, and 17 chapels, with a Catholic population of 71,838.

1. The first Bishop was the Right Rev. **John Janssen**, born in Germany, March 3, 1835, and ordained at Alton, November 19, 1858. He was appointed, February 28, 1888, and consecrated, April 25, 1888. He died, July 2, 1913.

2. The present Bishop is the Right Rev. **Henry Althoff**, born in Illinois, August 28, 1873, and ordained, July 26, 1902. He was appointed, December 4, 1913, and was consecrated, February 24, 1914.

5. ROCKFORD (1908)

Pope Pius X erected the Diocese of Rockford, September 23, 1908. It comprises twelve counties in the northwestern part of Illinois, with an area of 6,867 square miles and was cut off from the Diocese of Chicago. It has, in 1917, 110 priests, 94 churches, 28 chapels and stations, with a Catholic population of 58,199.

1. The first Bishop was the Right Rev. **Peter James Muldoon**, born in California, October 10, 1863, and ordained, December 18, 1886. He was appointed titular Bishop of Tamassus and Auxiliary of Chicago, June 10, 1901, was consecrated, July 25, 1901, and was translated to Rockford, September 22, 1908. His appointment to Monterey and Los Angeles, March 22, 1917, was later rescinded by the Holy See.

XIII. THE PROVINCE OF ST. PAUL (1850–1888)

The real history, civil as well as ecclesiastical, of Minnesota, may be said to begin in 1680, with the visit made to the Falls of St. Anthony and adjacent regions, by the Rev. Louis Hennepin and his companions. During the same year Du Luht explored the northern part of the State, and in July joined Father Hennepin at or near the lake now known as Mille Lacs. Not until 1727, however, were systematic efforts made to establish perma-

nent garrisons north of the mouth of the Wisconsin River. In this year a chapel, the first Christian temple established on the soil of Minnesota, was dedicated to St. Michael the Archangel within the enclosure of Fort Beauharnois. This fort was afterwards in 1730 removed to a higher and more beautiful site where now stands the Ursuline Convent of Villa Maria, and the Convent chapel very properly bears the same name as its historic predecessor, St. Michael the Archangel.[4]

The Diocese of St. Paul was erected by Pope Pius IX, July 19, 1850, as a Suffragan of St. Louis. It was afterward a Suffragan of Milwaukee until May 4, 1888, when Pope Leo XIII erected the Archdiocese of St. Paul. The Diocese originally extended over what was then the territory of Minnesota, an area of about 166,000 square miles, covering practically the same ground as now comprises the Province: namely, the States of Minnesota and North and South Dakota. The part of the Diocese east of the Mississippi River was taken from the Diocese of Milwaukee, the part west of that river from the Diocese of Dubuque. The first reduction of its limits was made in 1875 when Pope Pius IX erected the Vicariate Apostolic of Northern Minnesota. In 1879 Pope Leo XIII erected the Vicariate Apostolic of Dakota, covering what was then the territory of the same name. In 1889 there was a grand division of the Diocese of St. Paul and these two Vicariates, resulting in the erection in Minnesota, of the Dioceses of St. Cloud, Duluth and Winona; in North Dakota, of the Diocese of Jamestown, now Fargo; and in South Dakota, of the Diocese of Sioux Falls. These, with the Dioceses of Lead, S. D., erected in 1902; Crookston, Minn., and Bismarck, N. D., erected in 1909, comprise the Province of St. Paul.

1. ST. PAUL (1850)

The Diocese of St. Paul at present comprises twenty-seven counties of Minnesota with an area of 15,233 square miles. It has, in 1917, 346 priests, 271 churches, and a Catholic population of 265,000.

1. The first Bishop was the Right Rev. **Joseph Cretin**, born at Montluel, Department of Aix, France, December 10, 1799, and ordained, December 20,

[4] Cf. Article *Minnesota* in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*.

1823. He came to America in 1838 and was Vicar General of the Diocese of Dubuque, when he was chosen Bishop of St. Paul, July 23, 1850. He was consecrated, January 26, 1851, and died, February 22, 1857.[5]

2. The second Bishop was the Most Rev. **Thomas L. Grace, O.P.**, born in South Carolina, November 16, 1814, and ordained, at Rome, December 21, 1839. He was consecrated, July 24, 1859, and resigned, July 31, 1884, being named titular Bishop of Menith and later titular Archbishop of Siunia. He died, February 22, 1897, aged 83 years.

3. The present and first Archbishop, the Most Rev. **John Ireland,** was born, September 11, 1838, at Burnchurch, County Kilkenny, Ireland, came to St. Paul with his parents in 1852, and was ordained, December 21, 1861. He was appointed titular Bishop of Maronea and Coadjutor, February 12, 1875, was consecrated, December 21, 1875, and became Bishop of St. Paul, July 31, 1884. He was named Archbishop, May 15, 1888.

2. ST. CLOUD (1875-1889)

Mille Lacs, where the Franciscan missionary, Father Hennepin, visited the Indians in 1680, is in the present Diocese of St. Cloud. After that, no other priest came to those regions for 170 years. Church history begins really in 1850, with the establishment of the Diocese of St. Paul. In 1856 the Benedictines established themselves near the present city of St. Cloud, and the first Abbot of St. John's Abbey was made the Vicar Apostolic of Northern Minnesota in 1875. The Diocese of St. Cloud was erected, September 22, 1889. In 1917 there are in this Diocese 152 priests, 129 churches, 18 stations and chapels, and a Catholic population of 62,694. The area of the Diocese is 12,251 square miles.

1. The first Vicar Apostolic of Northern Minnesota was the Right Rev. **Rupert Seidenbusch.** He was born, October 13, 1830, at Munich, Bavaria, and was ordained at St. Vincent's Abbey in Pennsylvania, June 22, 1853. He was blessed as Abbot of St. Louis Abbey (now St. John's), May 30, 1867. Appointed Vicar Apostolic, he was consecrated titular Bishop of Halia, May 30, 1875. He resigned, October 19, 1888, and died at Richmond, Va., June 3, 1895.

2. The Right Rev. **Otto Zardetti,** the first Bishop of St. Cloud, was born at Rorsbach, St. Gall, Switzerland, January 24, 1847, and was ordained at Trent, August 21, 1870. He was appointed September 22, 1889, and was consecrated at Einsiedeln by Archbishop Heiss of Milwaukee, October 20, 1889. He was

[5] The Rev. Anthony Pelamorgues, pastor at Davenport, Iowa, was chosen as the successor of Bishop Cretin. He made a special visit to Rome, to be relieved of such a burden and returned to his people at Davenport. Cf. Rev. Dr. Schaefer, in the *Acta et Dicta*, Vol. 4, July, 1915. Hence the long vacancy of two years.

made Archbishop of Bucharest, Roumania, in 1894, which See he also resigned, several years before his death, which took place May 9, 1902.

3. The second Bishop of St. Cloud, the Right Rev. **Martin Marty, O.S.B.**, also a native of Switzerland, was born at Schwytz, January 11, 1834, and was ordained at Einsiedeln, September 14, 1856. He was consecrated titular Bishop of Tiberias, February 1, 1880, and was made Vicar Apostolic of Dakota. He became first Bishop of Sioux Falls, September 22, 1889, and was transferred to St. Cloud, December 16, 1894. He died, September 19, 1896.

4. The Right Rev. **James Trobec** was born in Austria, July 10, 1838, and was ordained at St. Paul, September 18, 1865. He was consecrated Bishop of St. Cloud, September 21, 1897, resigned, April 15, 1914, and was named titular Bishop of Licopolis, May 28, 1914.

5. The present bishop is the Right Rev. **Joseph F. Busch**, born, April 16, 1866, and ordained, July 28, 1889. He was consecrated Bishop of Lead, May 19, 1910, and was translated to St. Cloud, January 19, 1915.

3. SIOUX FALLS (1879-1889)

Pope Leo XIII, in August, 1879, erected the Vicariate Apostolic of Dakota, with boundaries corresponding to what was then the Territory of Dakota, now the States of North and South Dakota. The same Pope, September 22, 1889, erected the Diocese of Sioux Falls, covering the whole State of South Dakota. It now comprises that portion of the State which is east of the Missouri River, an area of 35,091 square miles. It has, in 1917, 126 priests, 187 churches, 46 chapels and stations, and a Catholic population of 60,000 whites and 947 Indians.

1. The Right Rev. **Martin Marty**, Abbot of St. Meinrad's Abbey, Indiana, was made the Vicar Apostolic. He was consecrated titular Bishop of Tiberias, February 1, 1880, became first Bishop of Sioux Falls, September 22, 1889, and was transferred to St. Cloud, December 31, 1894. He died, September 19, 1896.

2. The present bishop is the Right Rev. **Thomas O'Gorman**, born at Boston, May 1, 1843, and ordained, November 5, 1865. He was appointed, January 24, 1896, and was consecrated, April 19, 1896.

4. JAMESTOWN-FARGO (1889)

The first Mass, in the territory now comprised in the Diocese of Fargo, was celebrated at Pembina in September, 1818, by the Rev. Sévère Joseph Norbert Dumoulin, one of two missionaries sent to the Selkirk Colony by Bishop Plessis of Quebec.[6] The Diocese of Jamestown was erected, October 3, 1889, and comprised, originally, the whole State of North Dakota. The

[6] Article *Fargo* in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*.

See was changed to Fargo, April 6, 1897, at the request of Bishop Shanley and since 1910 covers the eastern half of the State, an area of 34,899 square miles. It has 102 priests, 178 churches, 60 stations, and a Catholic population of 69,871.

1. The first Bishop was the Right Rev. **John Shanley**, born at Albion, N. Y., January 4, 1852, and ordained at Rome, May 30, 1874. He was consecrated, December 27, 1889, and died, July 16, 1909.

2. The present bishop is the Right Rev. **James O'Reilly**, appointed, December 18, 1909, and consecrated, May 19, 1910.

5. WINONA (1889)

Southern Minnesota was cut off from the Diocese of St. Paul and the Diocese of Winona was erected by Pope Leo XIII, October 3, 1889. It comprises twenty counties with an area of 12,282 and has 117 priests, 122 churches, with a Catholic population of 68,500.

1. The first Bishop was the Right Rev. **Joseph B. Cotter**, born November 19, 1844, and ordained, May 23, 1871. He was consecrated, December 27, 1889, and died, June 28, 1909.

2. The present Bishop is the Right Rev. **Patrick Richard Heffron**, born in New York City, June 1, 1860, and ordained, December 22, 1884. He was appointed, March 10, 1910, and was consecrated, May 19, 1910.

6. DULUTH (1889)

The Diocese of Duluth was a part of the Vicariate Apostolic of Northern Minnesota when erected into a Diocese, October 3, 1889, and covered the whole of the northern part of the State, until 1910, when the Diocese of Crookston was erected. It now comprises ten counties with an area of 22,354 square miles, and has 61 priests, 84 churches, 35 stations and a Catholic population of 56,041 whites and about 1,500 Indians, a total of 57,541.

1. The first and present Bishop is the Right Rev. **James McGolrick**, born in Ireland, May 1, 1841, and ordained at All Hallows, June 11, 1867. He was appointed, November 15, 1889, and was consecrated, December 27, 1889.

7. LEAD (1902)

The Diocese of Lead comprises that part of South Dakota which lies west of the Missouri River. It was part of the Vicariate of Nebraska, until the erection of the Vicariate of Dakota and, later, of the Diocese of Sioux Falls. It was erected by Pope Leo XIII, August 6, 1902. It has an area of 41,759 square miles,

with 47 priests, 123 churches, 40 Indian chapels, 50 stations, and a Catholic population of 25,000.

1. The first Bishop was the Right Rev. **John Stariha,** born in Austria, May 12, 1845. He was consecrated, October 28, 1902, and was transferred to the titular See of Antipatris, November 9, 1909. He died at Laibach, Austria, November 28, 1915.

2. The Right Rev. **Joseph F. Busch,** born in Minnesota, April 16, 1866, and ordained, July 28, 1889, was appointed, April 9, 1910, and was consecrated, May 9, 1910. He was translated to St. Cloud, January 19, 1915.

3. The present Bishop of Lead is the Right Rev. **John J. Lawler,** born at Rochester, Minn., August 4, 1862, and ordained December 19, 1885. He was appointed titular Bishop of Greater Hermopolis and Auxiliary of St. Paul, February 8, 1910, and was consecrated, May 19, 1910. He was translated to Lead, January 29, 1916.

8. BISMARCK (1909)

Pope Pius X divided the Diocese of Fargo and erected the Diocese of Bismarck, December 31, 1909.[7] It comprises the western part of North Dakota with an area of 35,998 square miles, and has 75 priests, 134 churches, and 19 stations, and a Catholic population of 34,500.

1. The first and present Bishop is the Right Rev. **Vincent Wehrle, O.S.B.,** born in Switzerland, December 19, 1855, and ordained, April 23, 1882. He was elected Abbot of St. Mary's Abbey, Richardton, in 1903, was appointed Bishop, April 9, 1910, and was consecrated, May 19, 1910.

9. CROOKSTON (1909)

Pope Pius X divided the Diocese of Duluth and erected the Diocese of Crookston, December 31, 1909.[7] It comprises thirteen counties in the northwestern part of Minnesota with an area of 16,598 square miles. It has 42 priests, 73 churches, 12 stations and chapels, and a Catholic population of 24,600.

1. The first and present Bishop is the Right Rev. **Timothy Corbett,** born at Mendota, Minn., July 18, 1858, and ordained, June 12, 1886. He was appointed, April 9, 1910, and was consecrated, May 19, 1910.

XIV. THE PROVINCE OF DUBUQUE (1837-1893)

The Province of Dubuque was established by Pope Leo XIII, September 17, 1893. It includes the States of Iowa, Nebraska

---

[7] *Acta Apost. Sedis,* 1909, p. 290. The *Catholic Dictionary* has the date, March 21, 1910.

and Wyoming. The Suffragan Sees are Omaha, erected 1885; Davenport, 1881; Lincoln and Cheyenne, 1887, and Des Moines, 1911.

1. DUBUQUE (1837)

"On the twenty-eighth of July, 1837, Pope Gregory XVI erected the See of Dubuque, a city but four years old, assigning as the Diocese that part of Wisconsin territory lying between the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers."[8]

All this large territory formed a part of the Louisiana Purchase, was included in the Diocese of St. Louis, and covered what are now the State of Iowa and the greater part of Minnesota and North and South Dakota. The Diocese covers at present the northeastern part of Iowa, an area of 17,404 square miles, and has 246 priests, 229 churches, 67 stations and chapels and a Catholic population of 132,650.

1. The first Bishop was the Right Rev. **Mathias Loras**, born at Lyons, France, August 30, 1792, and ordained, November 12, 1815. He came to America in 1830, was consecrated, December 10, 1837, and died, February 20, 1858.

2. The Right Rev. **Clement Smyth** was born in County Clare, Ireland, February 24, 1810. He became a Trappist, was ordained at Waterford, May 29, 1841, and coming to America founded the Monastery of New Melleray near Dubuque. He was consecrated titular Bishop of Thanasis and Coadjutor to Bishop Loras, May 3, 1857, became Bishop of Dubuque, February 20, 1858, and died, September 22, 1865.

3. The Most Rev **John Hennessy** born in County Limerick, Ireland, August 20, 1825, and ordained in 1850, was consecrated, September 30, 1866. He became the first Archbishop of Dubuque, September 17, 1893, and died, March 4, 1900.

4. The Most Rev. **John Joseph Keane** was born at Ballyshannon, County Donegal, Ireland, September 12, 1839, was ordained at Baltimore, July 2, 1866, and was consecrated Bishop of Richmond, August 25, 1878. He was made titular Bishop of Jasso and first Rector of the Catholic University, August 12, 1888. After his retirement from the University he spent several years in Rome and was made titular Archbishop of Damascus, January 9, 1897. He became Archbishop of Dubuque, September 24, 1900, and is now titular Archbishop of Cio, to which he was translated, April 28, 1911.

5. The present Bishop is the Most Rev. **James John Keane**, born in Minnesota, August 2, 1857, and ordained, December 23, 1882. He was consecrated Bishop of Cheyenne, October 28, 1902, and became Archbishop of Dubuque, August 11, 1911.

---

[8] SHEA, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, p. 702.

2. OMAHA (1857-1885)

"When the Vicariate Apostolic east of the Rocky Mountains was established, it was supposed that the territory embraced in it would long be left in the possession of the Indian tribes. The reverse proved to be the fact, and in 1859 the Holy See divided it, erecting the Vicariate Apostolic of Nebraska which embraced not only that territory but Dakota and Idaho."[9]

The division above referred to by Shea was in fact made by Pope Pius IX, January 6, 1857, but the new Vicariate was left under the administration of Bishop Miege until 1859 when

1. The Right Rev. **James Miles O'Gorman** was appointed Vicar Apostolic. He was born in Ireland in 1804, became a Trappist and was ordained in 1843 He came to Iowa in 1849 to establish the Monastery of New Melleray, of which he was Prior, when appointed Vicar Apostolic of Nebraska. He was consecrated titular Bishop of Raphanea, May 8, 1859. He died, July 4, 1874.

2. The second Vicar Apostolic was the Right Rev. **James O'Connor,** born in Ireland, September 10, 1828. He was ordained at Rome, March 25, 1848 and was consecrated titular Bishop of Dibona, August 20, 1876. Pope Leo, XIII, October 2, 1885, erected the Vicariate into the Diocese of Omaha with Bishop O'Connor as the first Bishop. It originally included the States of Nebraska and Wyoming. It comprises at present the northeastern part of the State with an area of 14,998 square miles. Bishop O'Connor died, May 27, 1890.

3. The Right Rev. **Richard Scannell,** born at Cloyne, County Cork, Ireland, May 12, 1845, and ordained at Dublin, February 26, 1871, was consecrated Bishop of Concordia, November 30, 1887, and was transferred to Omaha, January 30, 1891. He died January 8, 1916.

4. The present Bishop is the Most Rev. **Jeremiah J. Harty,** born at St. Louis, November 5, 1853, and ordained April 28, 1878. He was appointed Archbishop of Manila, Philippine Islands, June 6, 1903, and was consecrated August 15, 1903. He was translated to Omaha, May 16, 1916.

The Diocese has in 1917, 161 priests, 152 churches, 33 stations, and chapels and a Catholic population of 65,650.

3. DAVENPORT (1881)

The Diocese of Davenport erected, May 8, 1881, by Pope Leo XIII, comprises the southeastern portion of the State of Iowa with an area of 12,000 square miles. This territory was successively a part of the Dioceses of New Orleans, St. Louis and Dubuque and when first erected included the whole southern part of Iowa. It was reduced to its present area by the erection

[9] SHEA, *op. cit.*, Vol. iv, p. 654.

of the Diocese of Des Moines in 1911. It has 135 priests, 121 churches, 13 stations and chapels and a Catholic population of 55,675.

1. The first Bishop was the Right Rev. **John McMullen,** born in Ireland, January 8, 1832, and ordained at Rome, June 20, 1858. He was consecrated, July 25, 1881, and died, July 4, 1883.

2. The Right Rev. **John Henry Cosgrove** was born at Williamsport, Pa., December 19, 1834, and was ordained, August 7, 1857. He was consecrated, September 14, 1884, and died, December 22, 1906.

3. The present Bishop is the Right Rev. **James Davis,** born in Ireland, November 7, 1852, and ordained, June 17, 1878. He was appointed titular Bishop of Milopotamus and Coadjutor, October 7, 1904, and was consecrated, November 30, 1904. He became Bishop of Davenport, December 22, 1906.

4. LINCOLN (1887)

The Diocese of Omaha was divided by Pope Leo XIII, who erected the Diocese of Lincoln, August 2, 1887, to include the State of Nebraska south of the Platte River. It has an area of 23,844 square miles, 88 priests, 135 churches, and a Catholic population of 31,138.

1. The first Bishop was the Right Rev. **Thomas Bonacum,** born near Thurles, County Tipperary, Ireland, January 29, 1847, and ordained, at St. Louis, June 18, 1870. He was consecrated, November 30, 1887, and died, February 4, 1911.

2. The present Bishop is the Right Rev. **J. Henry Tihen,** born in Indiana, July 14, 1861, and ordained, April 26, 1886. He was appointed, May 19, 1911, and was consecrated, July 6, 1911.

5. CHEYENNE (1887)

The State of Wyoming was a part of the Vicariate of Nebraska and afterward of the Diocese of Omaha, from which it was separated by the erection of the Diocese of Cheyenne, August 9, 1887, by Pope Leo XIII. The Diocese includes the whole State, an area of 97,575 square miles, and has 22 priests, 41 churches, 23 chapels and stations, with a Catholic population of 15,000.

1. The first Bishop was the Right Rev. **Maurice F. Burke,** consecrated October 28, 1887, who was transferred to St. Joseph, Mo., June 19, 1893.

2. The Right Rev. **Thomas M. Lenihan,** the second Bishop, born in Ireland, August 12, 1845, was consecrated, February 24, 1897, after an interval of nearly four years. He died, December 15, 1901, and was succeeded by

3. The Most Rev. **James John Keane,** consecrated October 28, 1902, the present Archbishop of Dubuque, to which See he was translated, August 11, 1911.

4. The present Bishop is the Right Rev. **Patrick A. McGovern**, born at Omaha, October 14, 1872, and ordained, August 18, 1895. He was appointed, January 19, 1912, and was consecrated, April 11, 1912.

6. DES MOINES (1911)

Pope Pius X divided the Diocese of Davenport and erected the Diocese of Des Moines, August 12, 1911. It covers the southwestern part of the State of Iowa with an area of 12,000 square miles. It has 80 priests, 88 churches, 12 stations and chapels, and a Catholic population of about 34,256.

1. The first and present Bishop is the Right Rev. **Austin Dowling**, born in New York, April 6, 1868, and ordained, June 24, 1891. He was appointed, January 31, 1912, and was consecrated, April 25, 1912.

7. KEARNEY—GRAND ISLAND (1912-1917)

Pope Pius X divided the Diocese of Omaha and erected the Diocese of Kearney, March 8, 1912, which covers the northwestern part of the State of Nebraska with an area of 40,000 square miles.[10] By a decree of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, dated, April 11, 1917, His Holiness Pope Benedict XV has, at the request of Bishop Duffy, transferred the See to Grand Island. (*Insulam Grandem.*) It has 51 priests, 85 churches, 16 stations and chapels, and a Catholic population of 18,645.

1. The first and present Bishop is the Right Rev. **James Albert Duffy**, born at St. Paul, Minn., April 13, 1873, and ordained, May 27, 1899. He was appointed, January 25, 1913.

XV. THE RUTHENIAN-GREEK CATHOLIC DIOCESE (1907–1913)

Pope Pius X, by a Constitution dated June 14, 1907, appointed a Bishop for the Ruthenian Catholics in the United States. According to the terms of this Constitution, the Bishop is subject immediately to the Holy See and is under the supervision of the Apostolic Delegate at Washington. He did not have, however, jurisdiction as an ordinary, but was to be delegated by the Bishops of the Dioceses in which the Ruthenian Catholics lived. By a letter of May 28, 1913, the Sacred Congregation of

[10] The limits of this Diocese were enlarged, May 13, 1916, by the addition of Wheeler, Greeley and Howard and part of Hall, Counties, taken from the Diocese of Omaha.

the Propaganda conferred upon him full and ordinary jurisdiction over all the faithful and clergy of the Ruthenian Rite living in the United States, so that now he is the only true Bishop of the Ruthenians in this country.

1. The first Ruthenian Bishop appointed was the Right Rev. **Stephen Soter Ortynsky**, a monk of the Order of St. Basil. He was born January 29, 1866, was ordained, July 18, 1891, was appointed titular Bishop of Daulia, February 28, 1907, and was consecrated, May 12, 1907. There are in the United States about 500,000 Catholics of the Ruthenian-Greek Rite, and they are served by 147 priests. They have 147 churches with resident priests and 150 parochial schools.

Bishop Ortynsky died, March 24, 1916, and the Diocese is administered by the V. Rev. Peter Poniatishin, who resides at Newark, N. J., and the V. Rev. Gabriel Martyak, who resides at Lansford, Pa.

(THE END)

RIGHT REV. OWEN B. CORRIGAN, D.D.,
Baltimore, Md.

ROSATI'S ELEVATION TO SEE OF ST. LOUIS
(1827)

A Pastoral Letter addressed by Bishop Dubourg to the priests of Louisiana advised them of the appointment of a Coadjutor, and the coming auspicious event of the latter's consecration. The wish of the prelate was that this ceremony should mark an historical date in the annals of the Diocese. As a place suitable for the ceremony, and easy to reach by the greatest possible number of priests, he appointed the church of the Ascension at Donaldsonville; the twenty-fifth of March, feast of the Annunciation, he deemed an ideal day: it falling that year on a Thursday, the clergy of the neighborhood—as neighborhood was accounted in those times—were able to come and go back without depriving their flocks of the Sunday Mass.[1]

Bishop-elect Rosati left the "Barrens" on Saturday, January 31, 1824, *hyeme maxime saeviente*,[2] for St. Genevieve, where he expected to take a southbound boat. But the waters of the Mississippi were drifting huge ice floes, and the traveller had to wait three whole weeks for a conveyance, "enjoying meanwhile the company of his confrère, Father F. X. Dahmen, C.M., pastor of St. Genevieve."[3] Finally, on Saturday, February 21, a boat was announced, and the next morning, after an early Mass, he commenced his voyage.

It was his first journey to the Southland, and a tedious and toilsome one it proved, particularly at the outset. The water was low; in consequence no less than five times did the craft run into sand-bars, and twelve full days were required to cover the 140 miles between St. Genevieve and the mouth of the Ohio.[4]

The latter spot no doubt stirred in Bishop Rosati vivid memories of past hardships and blessings. Five years had scarcely elapsed since (September, 1818), with his twenty-three companions, he huddled on a small leaky flatboat, descended the

---

[1] The letter of Bishop Dubourg is not extant, but the gist of it is given by Bishop Rosati in a letter to Father Baccari, March 29, 1824.

[2] *Diary*, Under above date.

[3] Letter to Father Baccari, March 29, 1824.

[4] *Diary*, February 22, March 4.

"Beautiful River"; there, on the Missouri shore, was the place where they landed, and waited ten long days for horses to take them to the "Barrens"; there, after their scanty provisions were consumed, they stared hunger in the face; there, too, they for the first time in the Louisiana Diocese performed spiritual and corporal works of mercy in behalf of a family of Tennessean emigrants famished, half-naked and destitute of everything; there, on the desert bank of the river, under a canopy of boughs and foliage, Mass and Vespers were sung on September 27, anniversary of the death of St. Vincent de Paul, and to crown the day, baptism was administered to five children of these poor Tennesseans.[5] The apostolic hero of the day, the saintly Father Andrew Ferrari, had now gone to receive his reward: stricken with yellow fever, he had breathed his last in New Orleans on November 2, 1822. Fain would Father Rosati have tarried an hour to tread once more the sand of this lonely river bank, seek the shattered remnants of the rustic altar, and kneel down at the place where he had celebrated Mass for the first time on Missouri soil. But thanks to the brimful Ohio, the Mississippi was again the "Father of Waters," promising the much overdue craft a speedy completion of her journey; and soon the winter mist screened from the lingering gaze of the traveller the spot hallowed by holy memories.

A week later, March 11, *ad multam noctem*, he landed at Donaldsonville and was received with open arms by the Pastor, Father Hercules Brassac. Two days after, he went across the river to tender his respects to Bishop Dubourg, just arrived from New Orleans and staying at the home of one of his nephews, nine miles from Donaldsonville; and, this duty performed, retired to Assumption, the home of his friend, Father Bigeschi, and of his young confrère Father Tichitoli, to prepare himself by a spiritual retreat (March 14–21) for his episcopal consecration. Then, driving by a roundabout way, he paid a short visit to the priests of the neighborhood: old Father Bernard de Devas,[6]

[5] Rosati, *Sketch of the Life of Father Ferrari*. MS. *Archives of the Proc. Gen. C. M.*, Rome. *America*, P. II. *Append.*, pp. 173–174.

[6] Formerly Pastor of St. Martin of the Attakapas, and, later, of the Assumption; was then retired from active duty.

Father Potini[7] and Father Rosti,[8] C.M., in charge of the parish of St. Joseph (Thibodeaux, La.); and with them returned to Donaldsonville on Wednesday, March 24. Bishop Dubourg and a number of the neighboring clergy had already arrived. The beautiful brick church of the Ascension[9] had donned its festive attire. Everything was in readiness. At sunset the roar of the mortar and the joyful peals of the church bell announced to all the surrounding country the morrow's solemnity. Then from every corner of the parish, far and near, issued forth as by magic the sound of hundreds of pipes, bugles, horns "and of all kinds of music," to serenade in good creole fashion the welcome guest.

On the morning of the twenty-fifth, a great crowd of people from Donaldsonville and from many miles around, eager to witness the unprecedented ceremony which they most likely were never to see again, thronged the church, overtaxing its capacity. The sun itself during the preceding days had yielded sway to torrential rains, and now rose up in brightness, drying the country roads, lending to every color a wondrous brilliancy and bringing cheer to every heart. Never had the far away country parish witnessed such an ecclesiastical assemblage wending its way to the sanctuary in pompous procession: a cleric[10] and thirteen priests,[11] half of whom were in copes or dalmatics, preced-

[7] Father Anthony Potini, a native of Velletri, where he was born in 1799, entered the Congregation of the Mission in January, 1816, and was sent to America while yet a scholastic in 1818, arriving at the "Barrens" January 5, 1819. Ordained to the priesthood on the Sunday before the feast of All Saints, 1820, he was sent during the spring of 1821 to take care of the parish of St. Joseph.

[8] Father Joseph Rosti was born in the Diocese of Milan; Bishop Dubourg persuaded him to come to America with several others of his fellow-countrymen. He was one of the travelling companions of Mr. Anthony Potini. Soon after reaching the "Barrens," he sought admission into the Congregation, and while yet a novice was raised to the priesthood by Bishop Dubourg in October, 1821. After taking his vows (June 1, 1822), he was sent to Lower Louisiana.

[9] "The church here is quite handsome; it is of brick, has two aisles besides the nave, divided by columns supporting the roof, and very beautifully ornamented." Rosati to Father Baccari, March 29, 1824.

[10] Mr. Hermant, who shortly after went to the "Barrens" to pursue his studies.

[11] Bishop Rosati's *Diary* gives us their names: Fathers Bigeschi, Tichitoli, C.M., of the Assumption; Charles De la Croix, of St. Michael's; Anduze, of St. James; Brassac, of the Ascension; Potini, C.M., Rosti, C.M., of St. Joseph's; Millet, of St. Charles (Grand Coteau), Peyretti, of St. John the Evangelist's (Vermillionville, now La Fayette); Janvier, of New Orleans; Bernard De Devas; Sibourd, V. G.; Anthony de Sedella, O.M.C., of the Cathedral, New Orleans.

ing the Bishop-elect and the Diocesan prelate. The impressive ceremonial of episcopal consecration was carried out with stateliness and majesty, not a whit less solemn for the fact that two priests, Father Sibourd, V.G., and Father Anthony de Sedella, O.M.C., discharged the office of assistants to the consecrating prelate. Father Anduze, pastor of St. James, was the orator of the day; and we may well believe Bishop Rosati, himself a discriminating judge of pulpit oratory, when he says the sermon, which was most appropriate and eloquent, constituted a worthy crowning of the whole function.

And the new Bishop? What sentiments filled his soul at this august moment he himself tells us four days later in a letter written to his brother:

> As for myself, I may honestly assure you that, overwhelmed as I was by the thought of a dignity surpassing my merits and of a burden much beyond my strength, I could do nothing else, during the ceremony of the Consecration, except humble myself and feel utterly confounded at the thought of my unworthiness. Still I take comfort in the consciousness that, far from desiring this dignity, I have done everything in my power to prevent its being bestowed upon me, and have consented to assume it only when those who are for me the organs of the will of God intimated that further refusals on my part would be of no avail. Anyhow, one of the shoals of the Episcopate I am safe from, being a Bishop in such a country as this: for here there are neither honors, comforts nor riches attached to the dignity—another motive urging me to imitate in my conduct the example of the Apostles, the office of whom I have been called to discharge. Recommend me, therefore, to the prayers of my friends and other pious souls whom you know.

It was Bishop Dubourg's desire that his Coadjutor should meet all the priests of the Diocese. Several had come to the consecration; but there were others whom duty and distances prevented from being present. Having, therefore, on the following Sunday inaugurated his episcopal functions in the church of the Ascension by administering the sacrament of confirmation to five persons, Bishop Rosati set out for his round of visits. By the means of his *Diary* we are able to follow him in this journey through Louisiana, first to Opelousas, the home of Fathers Cellini and Rossi, hence to New Orleans, where he arrived on Friday, April 9, *hora sesquioctava* p. m. On the tenth, after Mass, which he celebrated at the famous Ursuline

Convent, he called on Father Anthony de Sedella, and, on returning to the episcopal residence, found there assembled to tender him their respects and a hearty welcome the priests of the city: Fathers Sibourd, V.G., Moni, Jeanjean, Richard, Acquaroni, Portier, Janvier, Michaud and Bertrand.

Staunch friends of his as all these were, in their midst he felt there was an empty place; he sighed "for the touch of a vanished hand," "for the sound of a voice that *was* stilled,"— lamented Father Ferrari's. To the tomb of the zealous Canon, whom he had so much admired, revered and loved, he repaired on Good Friday afternoon, not so much perhaps to pray for the deceased, as to reflect upon the latter's self-sacrificing and truly apostolic spirit.

On Easter Sunday, April 28, he was celebrant at the Pontifical Mass in the Cathedral, and Bishop Dubourg preached the sermon. The celebration was, so to say, the installation of the Coadjutor, who left the following Saturday on his homeward trip.[12] Tarrying a while at St. Michael's and at Donaldsonville, he finally sailed for Missouri on the *Dolphin* on May 10, with Father Potini and Mr. Hermant, a Seminarian then on his way to the "Barrens."[13]

Ten days of uneventful travel brought the *Dolphin* to the Bois-Brulé Landing, some 12 miles from the Seminary; there Mr. Hermant disembarked and took care of the luggage, whilst the Bishop and Father Potini continued their journey to St. Louis, where they arrived May 20. From the rectory, where they were entertained a few hours by Fathers Niel, Audizio and Saulnier, the priests in charge of the parish and college, the two travellers started for St. Ferdinand. A warmer welcome they could not receive than that which was tendered them by Father Van Quickenborne, the Superior of the Jesuits' residence, and by the Ladies of the Sacred Heart under the saintly Mother Duchesne.

---

[13] Apollinaire Hermant, born July 23, 1800, at Rodez (France), had been adopted into the Diocese by Bishop Dubourg; at the latter's request he left the "Barrens" in the following September, and went to Bardstown.

[12] "All the priests of this portion of the Diocese have shown me the greatest affection; and as for myself, I have experienced an extreme pleasure in getting acquainted with those whom I had not seen before, and in seeing again the others from whom I had been separated several years." Letter to Nicola Rosati, April 18, 1824.

The next morning, the Bishop and his companion, having breakfasted at Judge Mullanphy's, returned to St. Louis. "There I saw General Clarcke (*sic*), presented him Bishop Dubourg's letter, and we had a long conversation on the subject of the missions among the Indians. Our meeting was most cordial; and since General Clarke (*sic*) enjoys great authority among the Indians, I hope he will not fail to favor and help the Missionaries."[14]

Bishop Rosati was anxious to get home. As he had nothing to keep him longer in St. Louis, and as there was a boat leaving the next day, he started back to the "Barrens," arriving at St. Genevieve in the afternoon of the twenty-third. An incident which happened at this juncture deserves mention, for the insight it affords into the simplicity of Bishop Rosati's character. "We found at St. Genevieve," writes the Bishop in his *Diary*, "Mr. Paquin, a cleric of our Congregation, whom Father de Nekere had sent to find out when we might be expected at the Seminary; for the Catholics of the parish had planned a solemn reception, and the men belonging to the militia wanted to come to meet us. On understanding the arrangement, I simply forbade Mr. Paquin to go ahead of us; and so we reached the Seminary together, unannounced, a little before midday."

Bishop Rosati, however, could not forbid his many friends of the parish to come to offer their congratulations, which they did on the morrow. But on the third day, he resumed quietly the even tenor of his life; his *Diary* for that day, May 26, contains this severely eloquent entry: "Mass in the chapel of the Nuns;[15] heard their confessions in the morning, and gave them a conference. In the evening heard the Seminarians' confessions."

What was the position of the newly consecrated Coadjutor? The question need not be gone into at length here. Suffice these few indications.

Bishop Rosati, writing to his brother on December 6, 1823, the very same day he sent to Propaganda his reluctant acceptation of the Episcopacy, says: "I shall continue to reside at the Seminary, and to live in our Community, teaching my classes,

---

[14] Rosati's *Diary*.

[15] The Sisters of Loretto, who had a house, Bethlehem, a quarter of a mile from the Seminary.

etc. . . ." This, indeed, had been particularly stipulated, at the time of his appointment, between Propaganda and the Vicar General of the Congregation at Rome, as the latter advised him:

> By virtue of an agreement entered into with Propaganda, you must remain Superior of the house and Seminary over there, and head of the whole Mission in America, with the ordinary powers of Visitor, or even of Vicar General, for all cases where there is no time to write to Rome and wait for an answer; and therefore you are empowered to appoint confrères to rule the houses with the title of Vice-Superiors.

This arrangement resulted naturally in that Bishop Dubourg, residing in New Orleans, had direct charge of the southern part of the Diocese, whereas the administration of the northern portion of it was allotted to the Coadjutor, under the high jurisdiction of the Ordinary.

That this was the *modus vivendi* agreed upon between the two prelates, just the first few words of the testimonial letter given by the Coadjutor to Father Niel, pastor of St. Louis, who was then leaving for Europe both to restore his health and get some material help for the Church of Upper Louisiana, will be sufficient evidence:

> Joseph Rosati, of the Congregation of the Mission, by the grace of God and of the Holy Apostolic See Bishop of Tenagra and Coadjutor of Monsignor Dubourg Bishop of New Orleans.
>
> Whereas nearly all the missions and parishes established in the State of Missouri and in the neighboring States have been *entrusted in a special manner to our care*, etc.

A little over two years after his consecration, Bishop Rosati became practically the rule of the whole Diocese. How this came about is well known.

On Thursday, April 20, 1826, Bishop Dubourg, then on his way to Europe, arrived at the Seminary. A note in the Coadjutor's *Diary* informs us that:

> Epus Neo-Aurelianensis extrema suae Dioeceseos necessitate permotus, incoepta perficere volens, atque nostrae Congnis fundationem in hisce regionibus stabilem reddere desiderans, in Europam iter aggredi decrevit, 1° ut a Superiore Genli saltem duos Congnis Sacerdotes ad Superioris officium exercendum idoneos, 2° ut ex Religionis propagationis amicis media ad Seminarii in Luisiana fundationem necessaria obtineat, *etc., etc.*[16]

[16] Rosati's *Diary*, April 25, 1826.

This was all—or nearly all— that Bishop Rosati knew of the plan. He entertained Bishop Dubourg at the "Barrens" for three days, invited him to preach in the parish church on the Sunday, and, the Monday morning (April 24), accompanied him to St. Genevieve. Bishop Dubourg "reached St. Louis on the eve of Ascension Day, May 3, 1826. On the following day he preached; and immediately after Mass went to the steamboat—to which he would permit no one to accompany him—on his way to France."[17] From New York he wrote to his Coadjutor,[18] and on the first of June sailed for Havre—never to return.

Meantime, at the request of the departing prelate, Bishop Rosati had gone down to Louisiana (May, 17), where the presence of a responsible person was needed. He returned home, July 19, just on time to celebrate the Feast of St. Vincent de Paul, and still under the persuasion that he was merely Coadjutor of the Diocese. What was not, therefore, his surprise when, on October 5, he received from Father Niel intelligence of Bishop Dubourg's resignation?

> "On hearing this," he wrote two weeks later to Father Baccari, "I was absolutely bewildered, and could not persuade myself it was true; because the conversations which I had with the prelate before he left here, and the letters which he wrote me before sailing made me expect something quite different from his resignation; accordingly I considered the report as absurd and a pure invention."

He was all the more inclined to this view that, at the same time he received the information, it was appearing in the papers of New York, Charleston, St. Louis and New Orleans—in this last place with very disparaging comments. The information, nevertheless, was exact; and a few weeks later, on November 4, Bishop Rosati, who had gone to St. Louis for the consecration of Bishop Portier,[19] received, in a letter of Cardinal De Somalia, Prefect of Propaganda, and in a Pontifical Brief, dated July 14, official notification that Bishop Dubourg's resignation had been accepted, that Louisiana has been divided, and that he himself

---

[17] SPALDING, *Life of Bishop Flaget*, p. 254. Louisville, 1852.

[18] He had already written to him from St. Genevieve, after Bishop Rosati's return to the "Barrens," on April 27.

[19] November 5, 1826.

has been appointed Administrator of the two Dioceses of New Orleans and St. Louis.

It might be asked here what were the causes which induced the Bishop of Louisiana to resign his See. Shea's verdict in this matter is unanimously accepted: "Discouraged at the difficulties which arose to thwart him, and confronted by bitter malevolence, he at last lost all heart and energy."[20] This is true, but incomplete. That indeed the old fractious spirit had not disappeared, many facts might be adduced to prove.[21] "The very name of Dubourg," wrote Father Borgna on October 17, 1826, "has an irritating sound in the ears of a great portion of the inhabitants of this new Babylon. You cannot imagine all the abominations which fill the newspapers of this city."[22] Even of the *sanior pars* of the clergy some had gradually become disaffected. The Bishop's preposterous proposal of Father Anthony de Sedella for Coadjutor had offended them. Neither could they help protesting against what they deemed a shocking disregard of propriety and blind partiality to smooth-tongued intriguers, when he recommended the wily Inglesi for the purple; nor were they to forget, if they forgave, the violent terms of the circular letter wherewith he had most unjustly lashed them, when they were simply trying to disillusion him. Again, several felt that, if the financial condition of the Diocese had become alarming, the remedy was not a wholesale multiplication of collections overtaxing the good will of priests and people alike, but rather more business-like methods of administration,[23] and, above all, less indulgence in the impracticable schemes of his too fertile and ever active fancy.[24] There were other difficulties, too; and in these difficulties the Coadjutor was involved; in consequence it will not be out of place to rehearse them here briefly. The two Bishops held opposite

[20] Vol. iii, p. 390. Cf. CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA, Art. *New Orleans*, p. 11; HERBERMANN, *The Sulpicians in the United States*, pp. 179-180. New York, 1916.

[21] That spirit was existing outside of New Orleans; as late as 1827, there was still at St. Michael's an *intrusus* whom Bishop Rosati declared himself unable to oust.

[22] Letter quoted by SHEA, *l. c.*

[23] SHEA, *l. c.*

[24] These facts are gathered from a letter of Father Martial, New Orleans, July 13, 1822, *Arch. di Propag. Scritture Referite nei Congressi.* Codice No. 7. *America Centrale.*

views on two points, namely, the opportuneness of the division at the appointed date, and the transfer of the Seminary from the "Barrens" to Louisiana. Whilst each was absolutely convinced of the justice of his contention, still the mutual friendliness of the two prelates never seemingly underwent any change, although it would appear that, towards the end, Bishop Dubourg's hyper-sensitiveness to contradiction made him somewhat reticent with his Coadjutor. It would seem that the division of the Diocese had never appealed very much to the Bishop. As the time appointed for its execution drew nearer, the Prelate became more restless. For, failing to realize the possibilities for Catholic development of Missouri and the neighboring territories, he called to Louisiana priests working in the North, and some who had gone South to renew their impaired health he retained. In the case of one of the priests of the Congregation thus disposed of in a manner contrary to right and to the contract, Bishop Rosati had even to remonstrate.

In 1825, Bishop Dubourg sent to the Pope a petition asking that the division be postponed for the time being. Bishop Rosati, on being requested to sign this document, at first demurred, firmly persuaded that the delay of the division was hurtful to the interests of the Church in Missouri. At length, however, Bishop Dubourg became so insistent that the Coadjutor, reluctantly and for no other motive, as he explained later, than the respect he professed for the Prelate, yielded to the latter's entreaties and signed the memoir. Never again was the subject mentioned again by either: for whilst Bishop Rosati's grief was extreme, he knew that Bishop Dubourg was so bent upon his scheme, that any doubting reference to its advisability would be unwelcome.

No less divergent, towards the close of the year 1825, were the views of the two prelates on the subject of the transfer of the Seminary. On this point, however, Bishop Rosati could be more outspoken, as he was responsible for the interests of his Congregation.

The question had grown gradually from a desire of certain priests in Louisiana to have a Seminary established in the South, yet without detriment to the one already existing at the "Barrens." As early as May, 1823, Father Cellini, C.M., then at Opelousas,

had broached the subject in a letter to Father Rosati; his ambitions were then limited to the foundation of a preparatory seminary for which, as he stated, Mrs. Charles Smith, the widow of the founder of the church of St. Charles at Grand Coteau, was ready to make the donation, under easy conditions, of a large tract of good land. At first, the offer looked fair to Father Rosati; on second thought, however, he revoked his acceptance; and although he was severely criticized at the time,[25] he soon had good reason to congratulate himself on the course he had pursued.

If the proposed new foundation was thus abandoned, its idea, nevertheless, remained in the air. At the time of Bishop Rosati's consecration, Bishop Dubourg opened his mind on the subject. In view of the coming division, Southern Louisiana should have its own Seminary: a donation of 1,000 acres of good land had already been secured; moreover, a zealous priest was offering $4,000 for the erection of the buildings. Bishop Rosati went to see the place: he found the location "one of the most desirable in Louisiana," and, on returning home, reported the project very favorably to the Vicar General of the Congregation.[26]

So far not a word had been said about suppressing the Seminary at the "Barrens": the plan was to have two Seminaries. But scarcely had a year elapsed when developments took an alarming turn. In the summer of 1825, Bishop Dubourg expressed the desire to see his Coadjutor and to talk with him *de gravissimis negotiis nostrae Congregationis et totius Dioecesis bonum spectantibus.*[27] Leaving, therefore, Missouri on July 22, Bishop Rosati met Bishop Dubourg at Assumption, La., on August 16. What were the *gravissima negotia* then treated, we learn from our oft-cited *Diary:*

> The Bishop and I had a long and exhaustive talk on the business for which I had undertaken this journey. Moved by the grave difficulties besetting the progress of the Seminary at the "Barrens" on account of the latter's scanty income, and wishing to provide Lower Louisiana with

[25] Some of the priests of the Congregation wrote to Rome, accusing him of "neglect, if not ill-will" with regard to the interests of the Congregation in this affair.

[26] Letter to Father Baccari, July 14, 1824.

[27] *Diary*, July 22, 1825.

another Seminary of our Congregation, the Bishop spoke at length on the necessity of such a foundation, and asserted it would give great help to the churches and the Seminary in Missouri. His opinion was, therefore, that I should as soon as possible devote all my energies to this foundation; that I should leave at the "Barrens" one, or may be, two priests with the boys of the lower classes, and go with all the rest to Lower Louisiana and conduct the Seminary and College there to be built.

My soul was pierced to the quick at hearing this; and I represented to the eager prelate the dismal condition into which the Church of Missouri was to be plunged by this move, depriving it, as it would, of all spiritual help. But on his retorting with vehemence that my refusal to consent to this capital project was tantamount to bringing ruin upon the whole Diocese, I found it impossible to resist longer: I gave my consent, and have written to the Vicar General of our Congregation to obtain his approval.[28]

Bishop Dubourg's new project, quite different from that agitated before, would have sounded the death-knell of the Seminary at the "Barrens"—that establishment which Pope Pius VII had declared to be of vital interest to the Church in Upper Louisiana.[29] At any rate, the half-hearted consent of Bishop Rosati soon caused him a great deal of anxiety; still this consent was not, and could not be final, since the matter had to wait the approval of higher authority. As often as he returned to the consideration of the subject, the more it seemed beset with difficulties; and he warned his Louisiana friends not to be oversanguine about it, and above all to show the utmost caution *ne Seminarium aere alieno gravetur antequam existere incipiat.*[30]

On November 8, just as Bishop Rosati, then at St. John the Baptist's, La., had written to the Bishop of New Orleans, the latter arrived quite unexpectedly. The topic of the conversation of August 16 was, naturally, resumed:

I urged upon the Bishop the difficulties besetting the contemplated foundation; and after weighing them carefully, we concluded that it is of the utmost importance that, before anything be done, I should find out what our priests in Missouri think of the matter.[31]

Bishop Rosati lost no time in making the promised inquiry. He arrived at the "Barrens" on November 21. Four days later he

[28] *Diary*, August 16, 1825; the letter of Father Baccari is dated August 17.
[29] Brief of July 14, 1823.
[30] Letter to Father Bigeschi, November 5, 1825. *Diary*, same date.
[31] *Diary*, November 8.

summoned to a council the priests of the Seminary: Fathers De Nekere, Dahmen, Permoli and Odin. The letter written the next day to Father Baccari rehearses most opportunely for us the progress of affairs since August 16:

> After my first conversation with Bishop Dubourg at Assumption, we separated, he to visit the parish to Natchez, and I to go down to New Orleans, and wait there for an opportunity to return to the Seminary. On account of the excessive summer heat I had to delay longer than was anticipated, and I paid tribute to Louisiana by being sick two weeks. Meanwhile, speaking of the new foundation with Father Borgna and the other priests of the City, I began to doubt the feasibility of the project. To carry it out, the Bishop of New Orleans is reckoning on a subscription; now, according to the judgment of all these ecclesiastics, this subscription will not net much; nay more, it would be unwise to launch it, because, as subscriptions have already been resorted to this year to build two monasteries in Louisiana, another would be too much of an imposition on Catholic generosity.
>
> When Bishop Dubourg came back from his Visitation, which produced much good, I laid before him my difficulties; whereupon he told me that, in order to make the foundation of the Seminary a success:
>
> 1. He intended to buy a house and a plantation, that is, cultivated land, adjacent to the uncultivated land which has been donated for the foundation of the Seminary: this purchase might be concluded by the immediate payment of $3,000, and the obligation to pay a yearly life interest of $1,200 to the owner, who is a man 74 years of age, but enjoying good health.
>
> 2. In order to have the funds necessary to build the College and furnish it, he would ask a loan from the State Bank; this establishment exacts an interest of 7 per cent and the annual payment of one-fifth of the principal.
>
> 3. To put in cultivation the land on which sugar-cane may be raised, he would enter into partnership with some one who would attend to the cultivation; the surplus realized over and above the expenses would be equally divided.
>
> All this appeared to me very objectionable, and I communicated my misgivings to the Bishop, telling him that, before coming to any definite conclusions I would have to consult our priests on my return to the "Barrens."
>
> Thanks be to God, after a steamboat trip of eleven days, I reached the Seminary on the 21st inst. I convened the Council, laid before them what has been explained above; and their observations were as follows:
>
> 1. It would be too dangerous for us to run so much into debt: crops are uncertain; we might expose ourselves to bankruptcy, and would be

forced to sell everything to the disgrace of the Congregation and Religion at large.

2. The number of our priests is too small to be divided into two houses; it will be difficult to find one capable of being Superior; this division will oblige us to withdraw the priests from the missions where they are now so fruitfully employed; again it would be unjust to do violence to the reasonable inclination these confrères have for the works of the holy ministry, if we were to compel them to spend the greater part of their lives in teaching reading, writing, spelling, etc.

3. It looks like downright injustice to abandon Upper Louisiana, that is to say, the State of Missouri, and practically to deprive of workers a country where there is such immense fruit to harvest.

4. Finally, we ought to write you about this whole affair, and wait for your answer.

Observations as just as the above cannot be wantonly disregarded. In consequence, I have written to Bishop Dubourg to wait a few more years before establishing this new Seminary: in the meantime we may come by the means and the subjects that will enable us to undertake the work without running into debt and ruining the house already established.[32]

How Bishop Dubourg received this request for delay, we do not know. Letters from him were delivered to his Coadjutor on January 5 and February 23, 1826; but the *Diary* does not disclose their contents. At all events, long before receiving these letters Bishop Rosati had been worrying considerably. His return home in November had been anything but cheerful:

I have found every body in good health, but the affairs of the house in wretched shape: debts have been contracted; the provisions are exhausted, and the barns empty. Rain failed to come in due time; hence, the Indian corn was dried up and scorched before maturity; moreover, this summer's unprecedented intense heat burned up all harvests, and whatever grain could be saved and stored up was devoured by wheat-worms. We had to buy at once corn and wheat: hence, almost all the money which had been given me by priests of New Orleans, I have spent in buying a few necessaries, and paying some of the outstanding debts. What I shall do after this, how I will be able to meet the necessary expenses, I know not. But *Tua, Pater, omnia Providentia gubernat.* This is my only gleam of hope. *In Domino speravi, non confundar.*[33]

---

[32] The *Diary* contains, indeed, on November 27, mention of a letter to Bishop Dubourg.

[33] Rosati's *Diary*, November 22, 1825.

What may have been the reflections of Bishop Rosati, amidst these dire straits, is not hard to surmise. Since the present distress was in his mind linked in some way to Bishop Dubourg's various projects, the gloom hovering over the former naturally cast its shadow on the latter. Surely this was no time to purchase property, to borrow money, and to plunge headlong into a doubtful venture. Then there appeared in the Bishop's whole scheme such a want of considerateness! For if the Seminary at the "Barrens" was, particularly just now, in distressing circumstances, was it not, after all, because of its doing the possible and the impossible for the Bishop and the Diocese? This is precisely what some self-appointed advisers had censoriously represented. What was to be done? On the one hand, to close the "Barrens" was to treat unjustly the Church in Missouri, and to give semblance of reason to the plea that this part of the Diocese was not worth bothering about. It meant, moreover, running hopelessly into debt;—on the other hand, to retain the Seminary, though at the cost of privations, and to do the right thing by the Catholics of Upper Louisiana, was to incur the Bishop's displeasure and appear ungrateful. The more Bishop Rosati weighed the alternative, the more firmly convinced he became that Bishop Dubourg's plan was ill-advised. Still he would not trust his own judgment; and as he thought of none more prudent, more unbiased and, at the same time, more conversant with the existing conditions, than Bishop Flaget and his Coadjutor, Bishop David, he accordingly laid the whole matter before them, ready to acquiesce.

The two prelates examined the affair with the attention it deserved; and so strong was their conviction that Bishop Rosati's demur was well-founded, and that something must be done at once to relieve his unbearable position, that the Bishop of Bardstown resolved to write without delay to Father Baccari. This he did on January 1, 1826. After explaining Bishop Dubourg's project to do away with the Seminary at the "Barrens," and to establish a new one in Lower Louisiana, and rehearsing the wrong done by the Bishop in calling South some of the priests of Upper Louisiana, Bishop Flaget thus concludes:

> 1. My Coadjutor and I firmly believe it is not only expedient, but urgent, to make the division: because, until it is made, all the zeal and talents of Bishop Rosati are kept, as it were, in concealment; and

for this cause, the time-limit stated in the Bull for the division ought not to be extended.

2. Our firm conviction is, that the projects explained by Bishop Dubourg to Bishop Rosati are prejudicial in every respect. If, indeed, the transfer of the Seminary takes place, the blow will be fatal to Religion in Upper Louisiana, entailing a loss that cannot be easily repaired.

3. We are convinced, moreover, that the project is fraught with danger, because it involves the contracting of debts without any hope of being able to meet them. Furthermore, we believe it necessary that the division should be made as soon as possible, so that Bishop Rosati may have the right to call back such clergymen as he may deem fit to help him in his administration. This recall will have, of course, to be made with prudence; but it is absolutely imperative.

This is our conclusion, grounded principally on the perfect knowledge we have of Bishop Dubourg. When Father Martial, V.G., arrives in Rome, you may get more information touching Bishop Rosati's situation, which will enable you to take prompt measures to extricate him from his painful position.

Bishop Dubourg could not be long kept in ignorance of this formal disapproval of his various designs. The moment that he learnt it must have been one of bitter disappointment: his endeavor to have the division delayed was criticized, his administration was found fault with, his projects were denounced as unsound and harmful—and that, by his best friends, by Bishop Flaget in particular! A few months before, the Bishop of Bardstown and he had already been at variance on the subject of certain episcopal nominations;[34] but the present difference was far more serious. The shock, we may well believe, exasperated the smarting pain caused by the manifold difficulties besetting him at home. He must have felt it all the more keenly since the constant strain wrought by these troubles upon his West Indies Creole sensitiveness had undermined his health. In this disheartening mental and physical condition, his long broodings over what he considered a total misunderstanding of his actions and intentions gradually overcast his mind with unfair suspicions, to which he, at length, gave vent in a letter to the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda, describing the "persecution" which he suffered from his clergy, and ending by a request to accept his resignation (February 27, 1826). His resolution to go to Europe

[34] SPALDING, *Sketches*, p. 253.

was a logical consequence of this first step. What would his jaded sensibility have not suffered, had he seen the letter written to Propaganda just a few days after his departure from America, by Archbishop Maréchal, yet a staunch friend of his?

> Certior factus sum RR. Dubourg Novae Aureliae Epum prima die praesentis mensis vela secreto dedisse e portu Neoeboracensi, intendens directe Roman adire. Quibusnam motivis ductus tam longum iter suscepit? Certe nescio. Cum tamen rumores vagentur, qui probabilitate non destituuntur, mihi officium incumbit submittendi S. Congni. quasdam observationes, ne videlicet decepta *romanticis* coloribus quibus iste Praelatus sua schemata adornat, aliquid decernere inducatur prosperitati Religionis nocivum. . . .[35]

On landing at Havre, on July 3, Bishop Dubourg notified the Secretary of Propaganda of his arrival in Europe, once more begging that his resignation be accepted. The matter was already settled, as we learn from the minutes of the meeting of Propaganda held on June 26, and approved by Leo XII on July 2.

When the first news reached New Orleans, it gratified foes and friends alike: to the former it meant "good riddance"; to the latter the solution of a well nigh inextricable situation. "No one expected this change," wrote Father Borgna in a letter already quoted, "yet all who know that most worthy Prelate praise his resolve and rejoice to hear it. It was time to put an end to his sufferings; and just, above all, that in the decline of his life he may enjoy a little peace and repose."

As soon as Bishop Rosati received the Pontifical Brief of July 14, 1826, he informed all the pastors of Bishop Dubourg's resignation and of the division of the Diocese by the following letter:[36]

St. Louis, November 6, 1826.

Reverend dear Sir:

> You may have been wondering why I remained silent whilst several newspapers in the United States announced that Bishop Dubourg had resigned his See. But I could take no step before receiving reliable information about a report which I had every reason to disbelieve, until I had official notification of it. My doubts in the matter ceased only

---

[35] *Arch. di Propag. Scritture Referite nei Congressi.* Codice No. 8. This letter is dated Baltimore, June 4, 1826.

[36] The original is in French. *Copiae Litterarum et Documentorum officialium a Rmo Josepho Rosati Epo.* Archives of the St. Louis Diocese.

yesterday. Two briefs wherewith His Holiness has honored me confirm most unfortunately the rumor which for several weeks has caused me very painful anxiety. Bishop Dubourg has actually resigned, and his resignation has been accepted. The former Diocese of New Orleans, as Pius VII, of holy memory, had decided by the brief of my election as Coadjutor of the same Diocese, has just been divided: the one part including the States of Louisiana and Mississippi, and the other the State of Missouri and the adjacent territories. The See of the one shall be New Orleans; and of the other, St. Louis. The Holy Father has entrusted to me, until further orders, the care of them both and grants me the necessary faculties.

You will certainly share in my regrets for the departure of the illustrious Prelate to whom the Diocese owes its priests, its colleges, its monasteries, its Seminary, in a word, all the good done in it since Divine Providence had confided it to him. I hope likewise that your zeal for the glory of God and the salvation of souls will press you to obtain from the supreme Pastor of our souls, by your fervent prayers and those of your parishioners, the graces necessary for those on whom this tremendous burden will eventually be imposed.

I am sincerely, etc.

Whilst the announcement of the division was gratifying news to Bishop Rosati, the prospect of going to New Orleans filled him with apprehension. True, Leo XII did not strictly command his choice; yet to a "child of obedience" a mere wish of authority is law; and the Pope's wish in the matter was so worded, his appeal to the prelate's zeal so earnest, that the voice of personal likes and dislikes should simply be stifled.

However, there was here more than a question of personal likes and dislikes: before God and his conscience, Bishop Rosati was persuaded of his unfitness for the See of New Orleans. The welfare of that Church was consequently at stake. His sense of obedience, on the one hand, and, on the other, the consciousness of his unfitness and of the interests of the Church, plunged him once more in a great perplexity. Like the year before, he thought of turning for counsel to his trusted friends of Bardstown; but as he wished to have with them a candid and complete discussion of the case, he dismissed the idea of a letter, and determined to go to Kentucky.

He could not, however, start at once: his parochial duties at the "Barrens" prevented. The exercises of the Jubilee had been announced for the first two weeks of Advent (December 3 to 17);

moreover, he intended to lay the corner-stone of the new parish church on December 26, and severe weather delayed the latter ceremony until January 1. Severe weather delayed, likewise, his departure for a few days. This enforced leisure he availed himself of to explain to Father Baccari the reasons which, according to his judgment, militated against his accepting New Orleans. Here is part of his letter dated January 6, 1827[37]:

> My motives are the following:
>
> I am now perfectly inured to the climate of Missouri, whereas that of Louisiana does not agree with me, as I have experience in my various trips there: as I am now rather stout, the excessive heat prevailing there is so hard on me, that I am then unable to study or apply myself to anything; and, moreover, it occasions me great inconvenience.
>
> New Orleans is a large city, the population of which is for the most part made up of unbelievers and other enemies of Religion. There is needed there a man capable of speaking the language eloquently, so as to impose respect for the Word of God, and not expose it to the danger of being scoffed at in the newspapers by such as go to listen to the preacher *ut capiant eum in sermone*. Now I have not the talent requisite for a ministry so important and, in that city, so difficult. On the other hand, in Missouri people are more religious, they come to church with upright intentions, and, on that account, no such bad effects are to be feared as in New Orleans, and some good is actually done.
>
> Moreover, all here know and esteem me.

Word came on the morning of Sunday, January 7, that it seemed possible to cross over to Illinois. Accordingly, early in the afternoon Bishop Rosati, together with Brother Blanka, who was to accompany him on the journey, started for St. Genevieve. Father Dahmen decided to go along; and crossing the Mississippi River with extreme difficulty on Tuesday, the three travellers set out on their three hundred mile trip. The Bishop's *Diary* enables us to trace every step of this journey most difficult and trying during that particularly severe winter. Suffice it to mention here their Sunday stop (January 14) at Union County, with Father Durbin and the Kentucky Sisters of Charity, to whom the Bishop promised a painting of their Patron Saint. On the following Friday, January 19, at 3 p. m., they arrived at Bardstown. "There," writes Bishop Rosati, "we were welcomed most cordially by the Bishops of Bardstown and of Mauricastrum,

[37] *Archives of the Proc. Gen. C. M.*, Rome. *America*, P. II. Monsignor Rosati, p. 51.

and by all the clergy, viz., Fathers Derigaud, Cellini, Elder, Reynolds, Foucher, Evremont, Kenrick, Cooms jun. and Cissel."

The Cathedral, the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, St. Thomas Seminary, Loretto, all these hallowed spots which, eight years before, they had learnt to know and to love, were visited in company with their episcopal hosts. In the intervals, particularly on January 26, the three Prelates had long and earnest conferences on the subject so near to Bishop Rosati's heart. The conclusion was that his motives to decline the See of New Orleans were adjudged *maximi momenti* by his two friends, who decided to write to Rome to this effect.[38]

Nothing further detained the Missouri pilgrims, and they started, without delay, their homeward journey. Toilsome and dangerous as had been the route they came by, it was now even more perilous on account of persistent bad weather: accordingly they decided to return by way of Vincennes. At Nazareth, on January 29, they took leave of Bishop David; and at Bethany, two days later,[39] of Bishop Flaget. Here it was that took place the touching scene described by Archbishop Spalding, so characteristic of the faith, humility and child-like simplicity and candor of the two prelates. "So deeply," says the historian, "was Bishop Rosati impressed with the sanctity of his revered friend, that on taking his leave he fell on his knees, and refused to arise until he would receive a blessing. Bishop Flaget, taken by surprise, on the impulse of the moment imitated the example of the other prelate; and the scene closed with a mutual benediction imparted to each other, and a parting embrace."[40]

The return journey, though on the whole as fatiguing as the trip eastward[41]—at every line of the *Diary* we read but of very cold weather, heavy snow, ice, overflowing rivers, etc.,—was interrupted by a four days rest at Vincennes, the first scene of Father Dahmen's missionary activity. At length, on February 20, they were back at St. Genevieve; and on the twenty-second,

---

[38] Rosati's *Diary*, January 26, 1827.

[39] Bishop Flaget would not let them go on January 30, "timens ne ob pluviam quae nocte praecedenti abundanter ceciderat fluvii qui trajiciendi sunt aquis redundantes impedimento essent." *Diary*.

[40] *Sketches, etc.*, p. 261.

[41] Brother Blanka came near being drowned on the fourth day.

in company with venerable Father Donatian Olivier, who was going to the Seminary to spend in retirement the sunset of his laborious days, Bishop Rosati and Brother Blanka arrived at the "Barrens."

The two Kentucky prelates had advised addressing to the Pope a memoir in which the administrator should set forth his arguments. But scarcely had Bishop Rosati returned home, when he was compelled to undertake another journey, this time to Louisiana.[42] There the memoir, also recommended by Bishop Portier,[43] was written, and sent through Father Baccari, who was urged to support its conclusions:

> I pray you to go in person to present this memoir to the Pope, and to impress upon him that sending me to New Orleans would spell the ruin of our community in this country; that, moreover, I could not last long, both on account of the climate which does not at all agree with me,[44] and by reason of the anguish which will shortly befall me in a place where I can do no good, and even may run the risk of losing my own soul. Finally please explain to the Pope that even though I have done no good here in America, still I have constantly desired eagerly to do as much as my poor strength permits me; and that I ask for no other favor than to be left here, where I hope to be able to do some little good, and where I prefer to continue to eat cornbread and suffer all kinds of privations, rather than to enjoy every comfort in Louisiana.

The last lines of this letter contain a touching and dramatic entreaty:

> If they insist on compelling me, I will go and throw myself at the feet of the Holy Father, and ask leave to go back to one of our houses in Italy and be employed in some of our functions. Ah! a person realizes the price and value of this our holy vocation only when he is not in condition to profit by all its advantages!

Nor was it to Father Baccari alone he had recourse to plead his cause at Rome. He besought Bishop Dubourg also to interpose in his favor; which the prelate did, in fact, in a letter to the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda in date of May 1, 1827.

Leo XII was moved by all these pleas. A Pontifical Brief was sent, May 20, whereby Bishop Rosati was appointed to the

---

[42] Departing from the Seminary on March 1, and from St. Genevieve on the third, he was in New Orleans the eighth of the same month.

[43] Letter received by Bishop Rosati March 9.

[44] On reaching New Orleans he had again a spell of sickness. *Diary*.

See of St. Louis, with, however, the duty to look after the Diocese of New Orleans as Administrator, until the appointment of a Bishop; he was requested, in consequence, to submit the name of a suitable candidate.

The brief was delivered at the "Barrens" on July 12,[45] At the sight of this document relieving him of his long anxiety, Bishop Rosati wrote in his *Diary*:

> Per publicum tabellionem accepi . . . 4° Breve SS.D.N. Leonis Pp. XII quo me ex Episcopatu Tenagrensi ad Sanctiludovicensem transfert, relicta etiam mihi administratione Dioecesis Neo-Aurelianensis usque dum. . . . Deo gratias. *Ipse mortificat et vivificat.*

CHARLES L. SOUVAY, C.M.,
Kenrick Seminary,
St. Louis, Mo.

---

[45] Bishop Rosati appointed Father de Neckere, C.M., his Vicar General for New Orleans, and recommended him to Rome as Bishop for that See. Bishop de Neckere was consecrated in 1830, and died September 5, 1833.

CATHOLIC PIONEERS OF THE OREGON COUNTRY

The first quarter of the nineteenth century witnessed a struggle for the control of the fur trade in the Oregon Country. The Hudson Bay Company, which ultimately captured the field, had the advantage of immense capital and thorough organization. The Northwest Company of Montreal, through the untiring energy and wonderful explorations of Alexander Mackenzie (1789-93), and Simon Frazer (1806), who discovered and explored the rivers which bear their names, obtained a foothold west of the Rocky Mountains.

On the return of Lewis and Clark with information concerning the possibilities of fur trade on the Columbia, John Jacob Astor, a New York merchant, who had long been engaged in the fur trade, decided to enter the new field. His first ship arrived at the mouth of the Columbia in March, 1811, and the crew, after many hardships, selected a site for a fort and founded the first American settlement in Oregon, giving it the name of Astoria. Astor's overland party arrived within a year with reinforcements for the new trading post of the Pacific Fur Company. Learning that the Northwest Company was actively establishing its trade connections among the Indians, the Astoria traders determined on an energetic campaign for control of the business. The year 1812 brought success to their efforts, but it also brought news of impending disaster. War was on between England and the United States. Before the end of 1813, a British warship entered the Columbia, took possession of Fort Astoria and put an end to the American fur trading. The Northwest Company retrieved its position and controlled the Oregon fur trade until 1821, when the Northwest Company became merged in the Hudson Bay Company. It was on the occasion of this coalition that Dr. John McLoughlin was sent to Oregon (1824) as chief factor of the Hudson Bay Company.

In 1818, a convention between Great Britain and the United States provided that citizens and subjects of the two nations should have equal access to the Oregon country for ten years. This arrangement was subsequently extended and it was not until 1846 that the northwest boundary was finally fixed. The

years between 1818 and 1846 are known as the period of "joint occupancy." It can readily be seen that the administrative problems arising under such conditions would be of an extremely delicate nature and would tax the highest executive powers. During this period the history of Oregon is largely the story of the life of Dr. John McLoughlin (1784–1857).

Establishing Fort Vancouver near the confluence of the Willamette and the Columbia Rivers as his headquarters, Dr. John McLoughlin took charge in 1824 of the immense commercial interests of the Hudson Bay Company in the Oregon country. The employes of the Hudson Bay Company at its score of forts in Oregon were, for the most part, Catholics. The old Northwest Company, representing as it did, the French Canadian traders, had practically none but Catholics in its employ. And even Astor's expedition was accompanied by Canadian *voyageurs*. Indeed, it was three members of this latter company who formed the nucleus of the Canadian settlement that later became known as St. Paul on the Willamette. Besides the settlement of St. Paul, four families were settled on the Cowlitz River north of the Columbia and about seventy-five individuals of French Canadian extraction lived at Fort Vancouver.

When these Canadians began to settle down to a quiet home life, there dawned on them a sense of the lack of religious instruction and spiritual ministration. The nearest ecclesiastical Superior was Bishop Provencher, who had his residence at what is now St. Boniface, Manitoba, being the auxiliary of the Bishop of Quebec and Vicar Apostolic for the district of the Northwest with the title of Bishop of Juliopolis *in partibus*. It was only in 1818 that the Bishop of Quebec had sent Abbé Provencher and an assistant to the Catholic settlers in the Red River country; and now the Canadians in Oregon, 1,500 miles farther west, turned to him for priests to reanimate their faith and reconcile themselves, their Indian wives and their children to the Church. At this time Monseigneur Provencher wrote to Monseigneur Joseph Signay, Bishop of Quebec, concerning the expressed wish of the Catholics of Oregon for missionaries. It was decided to send two priests to the new field and he at once entered into correspondence with Governor Simpson, of the Hudson Bay Company in London, for their transportation. Meanwhile, by an indult

of the Holy See dated February 28, 1836, the Columbia country had been annexed to the Vicariate Apostolic of Bishop Provencher.

The Oregon question had come to be a critical issue between the American and British governments at this time (1837), and the officers of the Hudson Bay Company in London objected to the establishment of a mission in the Willamette Valley which, lying south of the Columbia River, was in disputed territory. Governor Simpson suggested that the mission be established north of the Columbia and Monseigneur Provencher acquiesced in the suggestion.

In the meantime the Bishops had selected the priests who were to carry the light of the Gospel into the new field. The Bishop of Quebec gave charge of the mission of Oregon to Father Francis Norbert Blanchet, who was laboring in the diocese of Montreal. By letters dated April 17, 1838, he was appointed Vicar General to the Bishop of Quebec, over the territory "which is comprised between the Rocky Mountains on the east, the Pacific Ocean on the west, the Russian possessions on the north, and the territory of the United States on the south." Special caution was given him not to establish missions in the territory south of the Columbia, "the possession whereof is contested by the United States." (The Willamette settlement which requested missionaries was situated south of the Columbia.) Father Modeste Demers, a young priest who had been sent to the mission of the Red River country, was appointed assistant to the new Vicar General of Oregon.

The two missionaries arrived at Fort Vancouver after a slow and tedious descent of the Columbia, on November 24, 1838. They had arrived at the scene of their future labors and began, without delay, their missionary activity among both the Catholic Canadians and the Indians. No flattering picture of the condition confronting the missionaries is drawn by the future Archbishop. He writes:

> Many of the servants (of the Hudson Bay Company), and settlers had forgotten their prayers and the religious principles they had received in their youth. The women they had taken for their wives were pagans, or baptized without sufficient knowledge. Their children were raised in ignorance. One may well imagine that in many places disorders, rudeness of morals, and indecency in practices answered to that state of ignorance.

We have already noted the express stipulation on the part of the Hudson Bay Company that no mission was to be established south of the Columbia. It will be remembered, however, that the appeal for missionaries came from the Canadians on the Willamette. These settlers had erected a log church in 1836 as soon as they had received promises of missionaries from Bishop Provencher. This was the first church built in the Oregon country. On Sunday, January 6, 1839, Vicar General Blanchet solemnly blessed the church under the patronage of the Apostle St. Paul, and offered the Holy Sacrifice for the first time in the present State of Oregon. Before the close of the first year of missionary activity, notice was received from the Hudson Bay Company that the Governor and Committee had reconsidered their objection to the establishment of a mission south of the Columbia, and that the missionaries were at liberty to make such a foundation on the Willamette. The change of attitude on the part of the Company was effected by the representation of Dr. McLoughlin while in London. McLoughlin returned to Fort Vancouver in the Fall of 1839 and paid a visit to the mission of St. Paul, where he was greeted as a father by the devoted Canadians. This was the occasion of his first meeting with Father Blanchet.

During the years which followed the two became close friends and McLoughlin was brought to investigate the claims of the Catholic Church. The following account of the circumstances surrounding the conversion of McLoughlin was given many years later by Archbishop Blanchet in his *Historical Sketches:*

> When he (McLoughlin) was once on a visit to Fort Nesqually, *The End of Controversy* by Dr. Milner, fell into his hands. He read it with avidity and was overcome and converted by it at once. On his return to Fort Vancouver he made his abjuration and profession of faith at the hands of the Vicar General on November 18, 1842. He made his confession, had his marriage blessed on the same day and prepared himself for his First Communion by fasting during the four weeks of Advent, which he passed on his claim at the Willamette Falls, now called Oregon City. Being thus prepared, he made his First Communion at Fort Vancouver at Midnight Mass on Christmas. From the time of his conversion till his death, Dr. McLoughlin showed himself a true and practical Christian and a worthy member of Holy Church; never missing Divine Services of Mass and Vespers on Sundays and

Holydays; going to Holy Table nearly monthly and preaching strongly by word and by example. On going to church each Sunday he was often accompanied by some Protestant friend; one of them inviting him to go and assist at the services of their church, he answered him: "No, sir, I go to the Church that teaches truth, but not to a Church that teaches error." On hearing of this great man, the Holy Father, Pope Gregory XVI, sent him the Insignia of the Knights of the distinguished Order of St. Gregory, which Archbishop Blanchet delivered to him on his return from Europe in August, 1847.

We have traced briefly the beginnings of Catholic missionary activity on the lower Columbia and we must now turn our attention to an entirely separate and independent movement which lead to the evangelization of the Indian tribes of the Rocky Mountains. It was natural that the Canadians should have turned to Quebec in their quest for missionaries, but the Apostle of the Rocky Mountain Indians was to come from the United States, and the instrumentality which was to bring him to Oregon was the Iroquois Indians, among whose tribe the seeds of faith had been sown at an early date by Father Jogues. About 1816 a band of some twenty-four Catholic Iroquois from the Caughnawaga Mission near Montreal wandered into and across the Rocky Mountains as far west as the Flathead Valley in what is now Northwest Montana, and being pleased with the country and with the Selish or Flathead tribe, concluded to remain there and intermarry with them. The leader of this band was Ignace La Mousse, better known among the Indians as Old Ignace. He became prominent among the Flatheads and, being a zealous Catholic, taught them what he could of that faith and excited among them so strong a desire for "Black Robes" that in the spring of 1831, the Flatheads together with their neighbors, the Nez Percés, sent a deputation of two Indians from each tribe to St. Louis to obtain priests.

It was to St. Louis rather than to Montreal that the Indians turned for assistance, for since the days of the great travelers, Lewis and Clark, the traders had renewed their relations annually with that city. The four Indians in the delegation found General Clark still living in St. Louis. Two of the company took sick and died after receiving baptism and the last sacraments. The return of the remaining members of the deputation is uncertain. They had repeated the Macedonian cry, "Come over and help

us!" The Catholic missionary forces were too weak to respond at once to the appeal. But the presence of the Indians in St. Louis from far-distant Oregon on such a mission was the occasion of a movement with far-reaching results. The incident was given publicity in the Protestant religious press and aroused wonderful enthusiasm, setting on foot one of the most remarkable missionary campaigns in the history of this country, a campaign which was fraught with important consequences for Oregon.

The Indians, however, were not discouraged in their quest for Catholic missionaries. They sent a delegation to Bishop Rosati at St. Louis in 1835 and again in 1839. It was on this occasion that Father DeSmet came into view for the first time in connection with the Oregon missions. The Indians paused at Council Bluffs to visit the priests at St. Joseph's Mission, where Father DeSmet was stationed.

In 1833 the second Provincial Council of Baltimore petitioned the Holy See to place the Indian missions of the United States under the care of the Society of Jesus. In the following year the Holy See acceded to the request. Hence, Bishop Rosati turned to the Jesuit Fathers for missionaries to the Flatheads. Father DeSmet, deeply impressed by the visit of the delegation from the Rocky Mountains, offered to devote himself to the Indian Missions. The offer was gratefully accepted by his Superior and by the Bishop, and DeSmet set out on his first trip to the Oregon country late in March, 1840.

After two months among the Flatheads, DeSmet returned to St. Louis for assistance, reaching St. Louis University on the last day of the year 1840. On the Feast of the Assumption, 1841, he had again penetrated the Oregon country as far as Fort Hall on the Snake River. He was accompanied by two priests and three brothers of the Society. He had been successful too in securing financial aid for his missions from the bishops and clergy of the dioceses of Philadelphia and New Orleans. On reaching the Bitter Root Valley in Western Montana, the home of the Flathead tribe, DeSmet undertook to lay the foundations of a permanent mission. He chose a location on the banks of the Bitter Root River between the site of Old Fort Owen and the present town of Stevensville. St. Mary's Mission among the Flatheads had an eventful history. It was closed from 1850 to

1866, when it was reopened in charge of the venerated Father Ravalli. It is today a point of interest for the visitor of the Bitter Root Valley.

In April, 1842, Father DeSmet set out from his Rocky Mountain missions to visit Fort Vancouver and the Willamette Valley, a journey of 1,000 miles, to make the acquaintance of Vicar General Blanchet and to confer with him "on the interests of the great mission of the Pacific Coast." Father Demers tells us of how Blanchet and DeSmet ran to meet each other, both prostrating themselves, each begging the other's blessing. At the conference it was decided that Father Demers should proceed to open a mission in New Caledonia (now British Columbia), leaving the Vicar General at St. Paul while DeSmet should start for St. Louis and Belgium in quest of more workers and material assistance for the missions of Oregon. Dr. McLoughlin, though not then a Catholic, strongly encouraged Father DeSmet to set out for the East and Europe to secure recruits and supplies for the Catholic missions. Two years later, Father DeSmet returned, sailing from Antwerp on the brig *Infatigable*, rounding Cape Horn and bringing to reinforce the Oregon mission four fathers and a lay brother of the Society and six sisters of Notre Dame of Namur. After a terrifying experience, they crossed the Columbia Bar on the thirty-first of July, the Feast of St. Ignatius, 1844. A few days after the Feast of the Assumption, Father DeSmet and his company reached St. Paul and laid the foundations of St. Francis Xavier mission, which he intended should be the base of missionary activities for the Jesuits in Oregon. The Sisters of Notre Dame also took possession of the Convent which was under construction in preparation for their arrival.

Beginning with 1842 a tide of American immigration set toward Oregon. The 125 Americans who arrived in 1842 were given very generous assistance by Dr. McLoughlin, and when nearly half of their number set out for California, a few months later, he furnished them with supplies for which few of them ever paid. The first great influx of home-builders came in 1843. The company, consisting of nearly nine hundred persons, set out from Independence, Mo., on their long and tedious journey across the plains and mountains. They were led by Hon. Peter H. Burnett, who became the first Governor of California, and

J. W. Nesmith, afterwards United States Senator from Oregon. On reaching the Columbia River they followed its course. Their greatest difficulty was in getting from the upper to the lower Cascades. As the rafts could not be taken over the rapids, it was necessary to cut a trail around the cascades. Meanwhile the rains set in. The condition of the immigrants became desperate. They had not anticipated such hardships and were ill prepared for them. Few had sufficient clothing or food, and many were absolutely destitute. Dr. McLoughlin came to their relief. He furnished boats to carry them from the Cascades to Vancouver. He sold supplies to those who were able to pay, and gave credit, without collateral, to all who were in want. By his orders the sick were nursed and cared for in the Company's hospital at the Fort.

When the immigrants arrived at their destination, their trials did not cease. They had come in the fall of the year and were without provisions. The problem was to provide for their needs until the next harvest. McLoughlin came to their assistance without solicitation. He furnished the necessary supplies, gave credit, supplied food and clothing, and loaned the settlers seed wheat and farm implements. He assumed personal responsibility for the payment of these debts to his subsequent sorrow.

In forming any adequate estimate of the assistance rendered by McLoughlin to the early immigrants, two facts must be borne in mind, namely, that his action was in direct opposition to the policy of his Company, and that while he was performing these works of kindness he was aware that members of the Methodist Mission were trying to rob him of his extensive land claim at Oregon City. Of this injustice we shall speak presently. In answer to the question whether the secular department of the Methodist Mission assisted the early immigrants in a way similar to what was done by Dr. McLoughlin, Mr. Holman writes in his *Life of McLoughlin* (page 89):

> If so, I have found no trace nor record of it. Undoubtedly, Methodist missionaries, individually, did many kind acts to destitute immigrants. Had Dr. McLoughlin acted with the supineness of the Methodist Mission towards the immigrants of 1843, 1844 and 1845, and especially that of 1843, the consequences would have been terrible.

McLoughlin's action in assisting the Americans was naturally very distasteful to the Hudson Bay Company and caused a very bitter correspondence between McLoughlin and Sir George Simpson, who was Governor-in-Chief of the Company. McLoughlin declared that no person possessed of common humanity could do otherwise than he had done. This brought back the command from Simpson to render no more assistance to the immigrants under any circumstances. McLoughlin replied with his resignation: "If such is your order, I will serve you no longer." That was in 1845. A year had to elapse before the resignation became effective. In 1846 he retired to Oregon City to pass his remaining days on his land claim at the Falls of the Willamette. His resignation meant the sacrifice of $12,000 annually, a princely salary in those days.

While these political developments were taking place, a change in ecclesiastical administrations was likewise being effected. The Bishops of Quebec and Baltimore, acting in concert, recommended to the Holy See to erect the Oregon Mission into a Vicariate Apostolic. The suggestion was accepted and by a brief of December 1, 1843, the new Vicariate was created with Father Blanchet as its Vicar Apostolic with the title of Philadelphia *in partibus* (subsequently changed to that of Drasa to avoid confusion). The news of this action did not reach Oregon until November 4 of the following year. The bishop-elect decided to go to Canada for the purpose of receiving Episcopal consecration. Appointing Father Demers administrator, Father Blanchet crossed the Columbia Bar December 5, 1844, on a ship bearing the name of the river. He reached Montreal towards the end of June and on the twenty-fifth of July, 1845, he received his consecration at the hands of Right Rev. Ignatius Bourget, Bishop of Montreal.

Immediately after his consecration, Bishop Blanchet determined to go to Europe to obtain from Rome the appointment of other bishops for the vast territory under his jurisdiction, to secure new missionaries and more sisters and to collect funds to enable him to build the churches and schools which he saw would be necessary in the immediate future. Acting upon the advice of influential friends in Rome, he decided to request of the Holy See the establishment of an ecclesiastical province with an

Archbishop and several suffragans. To this end he presented to the Congregation of the Propaganda an extended memorial dealing with the history and conditions and needs of his vast Vicariate. The result of his petition was that, by a Brief dated July 24, 1846, the Vicariate was erected into an ecclesiastical province with the three Sees of Oregon City, Walla Walla and Vancouver Island. Five other districts were also named in the Brief, namely, Fort Hall, Fort Colville, New Caledonia, Nesqually and Princess Charlotte Island, but these were associated in administration with the three already mentioned. Bishop Blanchet was promoted to the position of Archbishop of Oregon City and Father Demers to that of Bishop of Vancouver Island, while a brother of the new Archbishop, the Rev. A. M. Blanchet, Canon of the Montreal Cathedral, was selected as Bishop of Walla Walla.

Right Rev. A. M. Blanchet, who had been consecrated Bishop of Walla Walla in Montreal on September 27, 1846, arrived on September 5, 1847, at Fort Walla Walla after a long journey of five months in wagons across the plains by way of St. Louis. The Bishop was accompanied by four Oblate Fathers of Marseilles and Father Brouillet as Vicar General. The Bishop and his party were received very cordially by Mr. McBean, Commandant of the Fort, who with his family were Catholics, and who figured in the Whitman disaster which was then imminent. The Bishop of Walla Walla established his mission a short distance from the American Board Mission of Dr. Whitman among the Umatilla Indians at Wailatpu. Meanwhile the Archbishop, on November 30, 1847, consecrated Bishop-elect Demers for the Episcopal See of Vancouver Island. The outlook for the new ecclesiastical province was bright, and as the pioneer Bishops looked over the field which they had so toilfully entered nine years earlier, there seemed to be promise on every hand of a bountiful harvest to crown their labors.

The day before the consecration of Bishop Demers, the Whitman massacre occurred in Eastern Oregon and brought the Catholic missions to the brink of ruin. In 1836 Dr. Whitman established his mission among the Cayuse Indians and became medical adviser to the savages. His work progressed satisfactorily for a time, but soon the savages became suspicious of the

encroachment of the whites on their land, and their suspicions were aggravated by the fatal termination of an epidemic of measles which spread among them and which Dr. Whitman vainly attempted to cure. It was the custom among the Indians to kill the Medicine Man who failed to bring relief to the sick. Internal dissensions brought about the decadence of Whitman's mission. The work, however, continued until the dreadful massacre of November 29, 1847, in which Dr. and Mrs. Whitman and twelve others were slain, and fifty-three others, mostly women and children, were taken prisoners. The following day, Vicar General Brouillet, ignorant of what had happened, came to the camp to baptize some sick children. Being apprised of the atrocious outrage, he buried the bodies of the dead and hastened away to warn Mr. Spalding, the Mission minister, that the Indians intended also to take his life. Father Brouillet met Spalding, told him what had occurred, warned him of the danger and, giving him his own supply of food, urged him to leave the neighborhood at once. Mr. Spalding took to flight. No sooner had he reached a place of safety than he began a systematic vilification of Bishop Blanchet and Father Brouillet, charging them with instigating the massacre. His charges were generally believed and aroused the intensest prejudice against the Catholic clergy. As a matter of fact, the leaders of the massacre were members of Spalding's own mission, as is confessed in a letter of Spalding to Rev. D. Greene under date of January 24, 1848:

> Most of these murderers were from the camp of Joseph who, you will recollect, was one of the first two received into our church and who, up to this event, has sustained a good Christian character.

As a result of the anti-Catholic prejudice, the work of Catholic missionaries in eastern Oregon was destroyed for two decades and greatly retarded even in the Willamette valley.

Many years later, Mr. Spalding invented an heroic narrative of Whitman's services to Oregon in which the Catholic clergy were held up to public view as enemies of American domination. The story told of Whitman's ride from Oregon across the Rocky Mountains in the winter of 1842 to place before President Tyler the importance of Oregon to the United States and to lead an immigration from the eastern states back to the Northwest in 1843. "Thus was Oregon saved to the Union," runs the legend,

"and the nefarious plan of the Catholic missionaries frustrated by Whitman's heroism." The Whitman legend enjoyed universal popularity for practically half a century, but today all historians are agreed that it is false in every important particular.

We have already related how McLoughlin extended the most open-handed hospitality to Jason Lee and other members of the Methodist Mission party when they arrived at Fort Vancouver, assisting them in the foundation of their mission work and treating them personally, as Lee himself says in his diary, "With the utmost politeness, attention and liberality." They showed no disposition, however, to return gratitude for his generosity. Particularly after he became a Catholic in 1842, prominent members of the Methodist mission strove to take possession of McLoughlin's land claim of Oregon City at the Falls of the Willamette. In 1844, McLoughlin, in order to avoid trouble, bought up their pretended claims. During these years he had been assisting the American immigrants and in 1845 he broke with the Hudson Bay Company, planning to spend the declining years of his life in Oregon City. In 1849 Samuel Thurston was elected territorial delegate to Congress through the efforts of the Methodist Mission party. Oregon needed legislation by which settlers could obtain legal title to their land, and it became Thurston's duty to secure the passage of such a Land Bill. The Oregon Donation Land Bill was so framed as to secure to the early settlers a title to their lands with one exception. By the terms of Section 11 of the Bill, the Oregon City claim, that is, Dr. McLoughlin's property, was to be put at the disposal of the Legislative Assembly for the establishment of a university. The effect of this section of the bill was simply to confiscate by act of Congress all of McLoughlin's claim, amounting to nearly six hundred and forty acres, including the site of Oregon City. All persons who had secured pieces of land from McLoughlin, previous to March 4, 1849, whether fraudulently or by purchase, were to be confirmed in their title. To secure the passage of a bill containing such an iniquitous provision required more than ordinary duplicity. Thurston came to the task fully prepared to carry out the behests of those to whom he must look for re-election. To compass his ends he issued a letter to the members of the House of Representatives concerning the proposed bill in which he charged

McLoughlin with wrongfully wresting the Oregon City claim from the Methodist Mission, and of driving American citizens out of the country under threat of letting the savages loose upon them. "Having at his command the Indians of the country he has held it by violence and dint of threats up to this time." These lies were so outrageous that Thurston thought it best to keep his letter from becoming known in Oregon until after the passage of the bill. The one copy that reached Oregon before that date had on the reverse side in Thurston's handwriting the following note:

> Keep this still till next mail when I shall send them generally. The debate on the California Bill closes next Tuesday, when I hope to get it passed—my Land Bill; keep dark till next mail.
>
> June 9, 1850. THURSTON.

As soon as it became generally known that Thurston was resorting to falsehood and calumny to deprive Dr. McLoughlin of his land, a public mass meeting of protest was held in Oregon City. A resolution was drafted repudiating the selection of McLoughlin's property for a university reservation, declaring that McLoughlin "merits the gratitude of multitudes of persons in Oregon for the timely and long continued assistance rendered by him in the settlement of the territory." A memorial was sent to Congress setting forth that McLoughlin was justly entitled to his land claim. But the bill had become a law before the memorial reached Washington and the attention of Congress was being devoted to more important concerns than the property rights of an old man in the wilds of Oregon. Shortly after the passage of the bill, a mass meeting was held at Salem, the stronghold of the Methodist Mission party. Resolutions were drawn up strongly upholding the action of Thurston; declaring that "The Hudson Bay Company, with Dr. McLoughlin as their chief fugleman, have used every means that could be invented by avarice, duplicity, cunning and deception to retard American settlement, and cripple the growth of American interests in Oregon." And the framers of this resolution were the men whom Dr. McLoughlin had fed and clothed and housed. He had cared for their families and nursed their sick. He had loaned them thousands of dollars which they had never returned.

He had saved them from the cruelty of the Indians. And this was their expression of gratitude.

Fortified by the last rights of the Church, Dr. McLoughlin died in Oregon City, September 3, 1857, an impoverished and broken-hearted man. His body lies in the churchyard there and the place is marked by a simple stone. In October, 1862, three years after Oregon had become a State, the Legislative Assembly did tardy justice to the memory of McLoughlin by returning to his heirs the confiscated land claim.

Thus three events, following in close succession, brought disaster to the Church in Oregon. These were the Whitman massacre, the gold rush to California in 1849, and the decay of Oregon City due to the confiscation of McLoughlin's property in 1850. The religious prejudice aroused by the first event has already been mentioned. The exodus to California in 1849 drained Oregon of a large part of its Catholic population and resulted in the closing of the Jesuit Mission at St. Paul and the schools conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame. The two religious communities withdrew from Oregon and devoted themselves to the new field of labor in California. The third event—the decay of the settlement at Oregon City—went forward rapidly after 1850. The town-site became territorial property and lots could not be bought or sold. A church and convent had been built at Oregon City at great expense to the young Archdiocese and the church burdened with a considerable debt. The decline of Oregon City withdrew all possible financial support and the credit of the Archdiocese was very seriously impaired. Saint-Amant, an envoy of the French Government, who visited Oregon in 1852 and spent some days with Archbishop Blanchet at Oregon City, reports that "the archiepiscopal palace was worthy of John the Baptist." From 1855 to 1857 the Archbishop toured the South American states for financial assistance. After two years' absence, he returned with a collection that enabled him to meet the more pressing debts of the Archdiocese.

The Archbishop now sought for Sisters to open schools. With the decline of Oregon City, the town of Portland rapidly grew in importance. A church was begun in 1851 by Rev. James Croke, a brother of the Archbishop of Cashel, and it was to Portland that the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary

came in 1859 under the advice of their founder, Bishop Bourget of Montreal, and in response to the appeal of the Archbishop. Twelve devoted Sisters opened St. Mary's Academy in humble quarters on the site of the present location of their Academy and College and again lighted the torch of Christian education in the Archdiocese. The same year, 1859, saw the admission of Oregon into the sisterhood of States and may be said to mark the close of the Pioneer History of the Oregon Country.

On June 18, 1883, the patriarch of the northwest passed to his reward. We may appropriately conclude this article with the following well-deserved words of eulogy pronounced by Archbishop Seghers at the obsequies of the first missionary, first bishop, first metropolitan of the Pacific Northwest:

> Do you realize it, beloved brethren? He is the apostle of this coast, the foundation of this Mission, the corner-stone of this Church; and the seed that was sown here and grew into a large lofty tree was sown by his hand; to him under God we owe the flourishing condition of Christianity in this country; and he is dead. . . . Do you know, beloved brethren, that a time will come when the name of Archbishop Blanchet will be coupled with those of Las Casas, the first missionary of Central America, of Marquette and Breboeuf, the Pioneers of the Cross in Canada and the States of the Atlantic!
>
> Why? Because he was the first missionary, the apostle of Oregon; he is to Oregon what St. Boniface was to Germany, what St. Augustine was to England, what St. Patrick was to Ireland! And, believe me, our children will envy us the blessing of having seen him, of having conversed with him, of having listened to his voice!

REV. EDWIN V. O'HARA, LL.D.,
St. Mary's Cathedral,
Portland, Ore.

MISCELLANY

THE VERY REV. JOHN EV. MOSETIZH VICAR-GENERAL OF PITTSBURGH, PA. A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Although the subject of this sketch played a fairly important part in our church affairs in his day, our historical records seem to have preserved but little more than his name. Therefore, in order to save his memory from undeserved oblivion the writer of these lines has resolved to gather up as far as possible, all the data still left on the subject, and what he succeeded in collecting after almost incredible difficulties, he respectfully presents here to the kind reader.[1]

Father John Ev. Mosetizh (or Mozetic) was born 120 years ago at Bilje, a village at the foot of the now famous Carso plateau, about 5 miles south of the city of Gorizia or Goerz, Austria, November 13, 1797. Therefore he was neither an Italian nor a German but a Slovenian by birth. He completed his studies with distinction at Gorizia and was ordained to the priesthood, September 22, 1822. Thereupon he was appointed assistant of St. Ignatius' Church in the city of Gorizia, a position which he held till December 31, 1824. In 1823 he made a very successful concursus examination in moral theology. As he was highly gifted he was sent by his Archbishop to Vienna to take a post-graduate course in the famous Augustineum. He stayed there a little over a year, but could not finish his studies, for he was called home and made professor of Biblical sciences of the Old Testament and of the oriental languages in the Central Theological Seminary at Gorizia. He filled this position for twenty years, from April 10, 1826, until his departure for America. Moreover he acted as vice-rector of the imperial Academy of the gymnasium in the same city, from January 10, 1837 to 1846. In 1845 he was selected by the newly founded General Commission for the Holy Land in Vienna, to visit Syria and Palestine for the

[1] Most of the data found in this sketch is taken from the *Berichte der Leopoldinen Stiftung im Kaiserthume Oesterreich*, Reports XIX–XXIV, and the *Gedenkbuch des Goldenen Jubilaeums der St. Marien Kirche in der Stadt Allegheny, Pa.* Pittsburgh, 1898. Thanks for valuable information are due also to Father Remigius Burgemeister, O.S.B., of Erie, Pa., and Dr. Andrew Pavlica, professor of theology at the Central Theological Seminary of Gorizia, before it was destroyed by the Italian guns in the present European war. Whether the precious archives of the archdiocese of Gorizia that furnished the writer with the data on Father Mosetizh's life in Austria were saved or not, is not known.

purpose of investigating the condition and wants of the monasteries and missions of those places. Having completed this task during the following winter, he made his report to the prince-archbishop of Vienna.

However, he desired to devote himself to the service of the North American missions long before he undertook this journey. Hence he obtained admission into the Diocese of Pittsburgh through Father H. Lemke, of Loretto, Pa., who visited Vienna in March, 1845.[2] Soon after his return from the Holy Land he resigned his positions in Gorizia, left his native country, and departed for America.

His journey as well as his early activity in America were described by himself in a report written from Birmingham near Pittsburgh to the Leopoldine Association of Vienna, January 1, 1847:

> I left my residence and my post at Gorizia on August 17, of last year, and set out upon my journey through Villach, Salzburg, etc., for Havre de Grace, where I boarded the mail boat, *Baltimore*, September 17, for America, as the land which after mature consideration I had with God's assistance chosen, with the intention of temporarily devoting my feeble services to its Catholic missions, the needs of which I had become acquainted with through so many descriptions and appeals. After a long, stormy and fatiguing sea voyage of thirty-six days, I stepped upon the soil of the western continent at New York, October 21, and after a few days of rest which I was very much in need of, I prepared forthwith to continue the journey to the place of my new destination at Pittsburgh in western Pennsylvania, arriving there by the way of Philadelphia and Baltimore, on October 30. As the Right Rev. Bishop O'Connor was just absent on a canonical visitation in some section of his diocese, the fathers of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer here, now presided over by the much praised missionary, Father John Nep. Neumann, from the Diocese of Budweis in Bohemia, as their superior, had the kindness to give me temporary lodging in their little home.
>
> Hardly had I heard of the Right Reverend Bishop's return from his official journey, when I went to introduce myself to him, and was received by his Lordship with genuine joy and most hearty kindness. He invited me immediately to establish myself in the Bishop's house until I received my appointment. In the course of our conversation which we carried on in Italian, there came up the important question of what position I should like to have in the Diocese, to which I naturally replied, that I had come over here to be entirely at his free disposal; thereupon the kind Bishop took me by the hand and said: "You shall stay

[2] *Berichte der Leopoldinen Stiftung*, Report XIX, p. 13 *note*. Dr. Joseph Salzbacher has April for March (cf. *Meine Reise nach Nord-Amerika im Jahre* 1842, p. 420. Vienna, 1845.). He calls Father Mosetizh *Doctor of Theology* (*ibid.*).

with me here in Pittsburgh, in order to give the necessary instruction to the theologians in my seminary, opened only two months ago, which—had you not come—I would be obliged to do myself." Consequently, I am again teaching theology, that is to say dogma and moral, four hours every day, and in addition to that I am explaining Sacred Scriptures four hours a week. I go from the cathedral of Pittsburgh to Birmingham, a distance of 4 miles, where the seminary building stands, and back again, four times a day. The seminary consists in a small farm house amidst an orchard, comprising 37 acres of land, extending along the slope of the hill on the other side of the Monongahela and fenced in by boards. The Right Reverend Bishop has bought the whole estate for 9,500 dollars, on credit, and hopes in the future to get the necessary financial means enabling him to erect a regular suitable building on this very healthy place, free from the smoke of Pittsburgh. The house, bordering on the Bishop's residence, and destined for the seminary in the beginning, did not prove suitable for this purpose; hence it was left to the teaching brothers who had come from Ireland last year, for the use of their schools. In the aforementioned small seminary building there are lodged fourteen pupils, seven of whom are studying theology and the other seven philosophy. I am presiding over the former in the capacity of a prefect and professor, and a young Irish priest is presiding over the latter in the same capacity. The whole house contains but four apartments: a study room which has to serve also the purpose of a house oratory, two sleeping apartments, and a room divided by a board partition into two chambers wherein the two teaching individuals are staying. There is no school-room proper; for, the one is giving instruction in his sitting-room and the other sometimes in the study room and sometimes in the refectory. The desks of the students are book-cases at the same time, but unfortunately almost without books; for the present it would be well, if they contained at least ordinary good text-books, but even these are yet wanting.[1]

From this letter it is evident that Father Mosetizh was made president of the theological department of St. Michael's Seminary immediately after his arrival in Pittsburgh. Moreover he exercised great zeal for souls in the city and the surrounding country when his ordinary duties would permit, especially among the Germans, who then migrated to western Pennsylvania in considerable numbers, for there was a great lack of German-speaking priests. Owing to his remarkable zeal, learning, and prudence, he was appointed Vicar-General of the Diocese by the Bishop, soon after his arrival.

It seems difficult to determine the exact time, when this was done. Monsignor Lambing's "Foundation Stones of a Great Diocese," page

[1] *Berichte*, Report XX, pp. 17–28.

242, states that Father Mosetizh's name first appears as vicar-general in the "Directory" for 1847, which would mean that he was appointed vicar-general in 1846; however, this could hardly be proved from the above mentioned source, which seems to make no reference to the office in connection with Father Mosetizh. I addressed his Lordship, the Right Reverend Bishop of Pittsburgh, requesting him kindly to consult the archives of his diocese and thus clear up the point in question, if possible, and received the following answer:

> There are but scanty records of the official appointments of Right Rev. Michael O'Connor. After a diligent search I must report that I can find nothing that would enable us to fix the date of the appointment of Rev. John E. Mosetizh, Vicar-General. It was probably in 1847. . . .

Bishop Canevin's opinion is undoubtedly correct, for Father Mosetizh actually signed himself Vicar-General as early as September, 1847, if not earlier. He held this office at first only for the German Catholics of the Diocese, while Father James A. Stillinger was Vicar-General for the remaining faithful. But when the latter resigned in November, 1848, Father Mosetizh became Vicar-General for the entire Diocese and remained such till his final departure for Europe.

He took up the duties of this new position with admirable zeal and energy, for he fully realized its responsibility. He was always willing to lend a helping hand either to organize new congregations, or to build up those already in existence, wherever necessary. Thus he took charge, temporarily, of Erie and its missions in the latter part of September, 1847, attending them up to the middle of May, 1848, as there was no other priest to do it. During his stay of seven months and a half he had forty-nine baptisms, thirteen marriages, and twenty-three funerals which were not exclusively of the city of Erie, but also of the surrounding towns and villages.

In addition to this, his activities extended over many other places of the diocese, as is evident from the letter written by Bishop O'Connor to the Leopoldine Association of Vienna, January 10, 1848. With respect to our subject matter, this letter is rather incoherent, because it deals with the conditions among the German Catholics of the diocese and their religious needs in general. Yet it seems advisable to give those parts of the letter referring to Father Mosetizh just as they were written, because the conditions described there are interesting in themselves, and, moreover, they immediately concern our subject.

In this letter Bishop O'Connor emphasizes the need of two more German churches in the suburbs of Pittsburgh, one in Allegheny and the other in Birmingham. Then he goes on to say: "The Rev. Father

Mozetizh has already made all the preparations for the erection of a church at Birmingham, opened the necessary subscriptions of the faithful, and there seems to be every appearance of being able to make the start on it this year. Of course, the need of a church is still greater in Allegheny, but since there is no priest that could or would undertake the work, nothing can be done there.

"In the counties of Erie and Crawford there are about 1,500 German Catholics. These have a separate church in the city of Erie which in the meantime is attended to by Father Mosetizh whom I have sent thither from the seminary for a while in order that the faithful residing there may not be altogether deprived of the necessary care of their souls till I find a priest suitable for their spiritual guidance and direction. The church there is unfortunately very limited in space, and efforts are being made to enlarge it as soon as possible. Since I know this myself to be extremely necessary on account of the number of the faithful of the town as well as because of those meeting there from the neighboring villages, I have resolved to have a part of the donation from the Leopoldine Association sent to that parish. Father Mosetizh is making arrangements for the enlargement of the building and, trusting in his prudence, he may spend half of the aforesaid donation for the erection of a church in Birmingham, if he finds it advisable.

"The Germans living in Crawford County are attended to by the missionary of Erie. They just came from Germany, and intend to put up a church at Meadville, the main town of this county. I have left the matter to Father Mosetizh, and the building may be started with the coming spring."

Referring again to the money sent him by the Leopoldine Association the Bishop says: "I left $950 to Father Mosetizh's free disposal to use it either for the erection of a church in Birmingham, or Meadville, or for the enlargement of the church at Erie according as he will deem it well."

"I number," continues the Bishop, "forty missionary priests in my diocese. Of these sixteen are German and seven understand the German language, at least so as to be able to minister to such parishes. In order that the German congregations may enjoy all care, I have appointed Father Mosetizh, Vicar-General for them in my diocese. He is at the same time president of the seminary and professor in several branches of theology. As I was forced to send him to Erie for some time, I am acting meanwhile as his substitute in the seminary, but only till he returns."[4]

Father Mosetizh returned from Erie to Pittsburgh in May, 1848. Whether he enlarged the church at Erie and built one at Meadville, I could not ascertain. Probably he did both. At least, the church of

[4] *Berichte*, Report XXII, pp. 12–21.

St. Agatha at Meadville was founded in 1849,[5] which would indicate that his efforts there were crowned with success.

A considerable number of German Catholics had settled around the seminary at Birmingham. As they possessed no church of their own, Father Mosetizh organized them in 1847, and began to take up subscriptions among them. On his return from Erie, a church was built upon a lot, donated by Bishop O'Connor, near the seminary. The cornerstone was laid, July 16, 1848, and the church blessed in honor of St. Michael the Archangel, by the Bishop, November 24, of the same year. Soon afterward this congregation was separated from the church of St. Philomena, Pittsburgh, where it had belonged, and became an independent parish when Father Mosetizh provided it with a pastor of its own in the person of a diocesan priest, the Rev. M. Schifferer. Thus the parish of St. Michael was formed which today is one of the largest parishes in Pittsburgh.

The city of Allegheny, then containing a population of some 20,000 souls, was still without a Catholic church. Its numerous inhabitants as well as the faithful from the surrounding country were obliged, like those of Birmingham, to go to Pittsburgh to fulfill their religious duties. Since there was no other priest to do anything for them, Father Mosetizh took the matter into his own hands. In the summer of 1848, he bought a piece of ground 150 feet square in the middle of Allegheny for the sum of $6,000, and began to build a church upon it partly of brick and partly of wood. The structure was completed in three months, and solemnly blessed by Bishop O'Connor in honor of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, December 17, 1848. A parishioner wrote on that occasion: "The Bishop preached a short and unctuous sermon wherein he expressed his delight in the zeal of the Catholics of this place, and our reverend pastor, Dr. Mosetizh, preached during the high Mass in his well-known excellent manner in the German language."[6] This church was not large, measuring but 90 feet in length and 40 feet in width, and was destined for temporary use only; but it was neat and would do honor to many a parish even nowadays. The expenses of the church and lot were covered by the contributions of the people and partly by a loan.

How large this parish was when founded cannot be said with certainty. However, if we consider the fact that it numbered 194 baptisms, 27 marriages and 89 funerals from the dedication of its church to the

---

[5] *Schematismus der kath. Geistlichkeit deutscher Zunge in den Vereinigten Staaten Amerikas*, p. 113. Milwaukee, 1892.

[6] *Wahrheitsfreund*, Vol. xii, pp. 234–5.

close of 1849, we will be able to form some idea of the amount of work Father Mosetizh had to do. Hence he was given an assistant to share the burden with him in 1849. During his stay at Allegheny he lived in a private house.

We may well imagine that a congregation of such size had many children of school age. Special schools were opened for these at Allegheny by the Redemptorist fathers of Pittsburgh a few years before the arrival of Father Mosetizh, who now took possession of them and endeavored to keep them up to date. He succeeded all the more easily as he himself was an excellent teacher and a great lover of children.[7]

He had scarcely organized St. Mary's parish and provided it with the things most necessary when he left for Europe in compliance with the wish of his Bishop in order to secure some German-speaking priests for the diocese. For this purpose he visited several dioceses in Germany, and went to Austria in the beginning of 1850. He succeeded in obtaining a number of missionaries for America. For the diocese of Pittsburgh he secured four secular priests, among them Fathers George Gostenzhnik, John Stibiel, and J. B. Schafleitner, and a Carmelite priest, Joseph Theresius Gesowsky. Three Franciscan priests, Accurtius Gaertner, Firmin Eberhard, and Anselm Koch, were destined for the diocese of Nashville, Tenn.; Father Leo Susan went to Milwaukee, Wis.; Joseph Schneider, a theological student, joined the diocese of Chicago, Ill., etc. Some of these priests accompanied Father Mosetizh to America, others followed him shortly afterwards.

After his return from Europe, Father Mosetizh did not stay long in Allegheny. He left St. Mary's parish to his successor and former pupil, Father Stibiel, on the latter's arrival in October, 1850, and returned to St. Michael's Seminary where he thenceforth resided and labored as Vicar-General, rector and professor. From that place he wrote a report to the Leopoldine Association of Vienna, dated March 21, 1851,[8] in which he states, among other things, the following:

> My journey to Europe, which I undertook at the wish of my Right Reverend Bishop, Michael O'Connor, D.D., during the winter of the past year, to recruit laborers for the German portion of this waste vineyard of the Lord, has been crowned with the desired success, particularly in Austria, for there were assigned to me 3,000 florins from

---

[7] *Gedenkbuch*, pp. 23–7, 142. He erected no school or residence at Allegheny; the building of 1851, mentioned by Monsignor Lambing (*History of the Diocese of Pittsburgh*, p. 165; *Foundation Stones*, Vol. i, p. 242), was put up by Father Stibiel, his successor.

[8] *Berichte*, Report XXIV, pp. 59–71.

the fund of the Leopoldine Association in Vienna to defray the diocesan wants for me as well as for the missionaries enlisted, and from the dioceses of Linz, Lavant and Gorizia I was followed to America by priests who are working with the greatest zeal and best success for the welfare of the rather forlorn German Catholics of this country. With these five new secular and religious priests from Germany, added to those who were here already, the diocese of Pittsburgh has, thanks be to God! tolerably well provided for the needs of its German faithful for the present.

Then he runs briefly over the history of the Catholic Church in western Pennsylvania, mentioning different missions, religious societies and institutions of the Pittsburgh diocese, and adds:

Provision for the new generation of the diocesan clergy is mad with the erection of a diocesan seminary already since the year 1846 This has also a small foundation fund; nevertheless, in order to secure its existence, it has to be supported by yearly collections to be taken up throughout the whole diocese. There are twenty young men in it during the current year, one half of whom are studying theology, the other half, philosophy.

This letter was published in the "Berichte der Leopoldinen Stiftung" for 1852. In a note attached to it by the editor we read:

The Vicar-General reports with this letter to have contracted a grave disease which has broken his strength in such a manner as to render him unfit for further service in the missions of North America. According to this and further information he has, on account of his shattered health, actually left his missionary charge, and has again returned to his native Archdiocese of Gorizia.

He left Pittsburgh probably at the end of the spring of 1851. Shortly after that cholera broke out with great violence in the city, and compelled the seminary to close. Its students were sent to other institutions, and the seminary building was turned into an orphanage.

Father Mosetizh arrived in Austria, in 1851, and owing to the mild and invigorating climate of his native country he soon regained strength enough to be made pastor of Cernice in the valley of Vipava near Gorizia. On May 18, 1853, he was appointed Dean of the Cathedral Chapter in Gorizia, a most important position which he held for ten years. As such he died at Gorizia, September 7, 1863, aged 65 years.

Father Mosetizh was, as far as he is still remembered by the old priests, a man of great talents and an accomplished scholar.

Rev. John L. Zaplotnik,
Omaha, Nebr.

DOCUMENTS

THE MEDIEVAL AMERICAN CHURCH

Some twenty years ago, the present Bishop of Sioux Falls, S. D., the Right Rev. Thomas O'Gorman, D.D., at that time Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Catholic University of America, published the first synthetic account in English of the rise and fall of the Church in Greenland.[1] His studies in this little known period of American Church History were based upon two works: the *Flatey Book* (*Flateyjarbok*), issued by the Royal Danish General Staff, in Copenhagen, 1893; and the *Documenta Selecta*, printed in facsimile at Rome in 1893, by J. C. Heywood, as a contribution to the World's Fair of Chicago. At the time of the publication of these manuscripts, American antiquarian lore had attracted the attention of ethnologists, historians, and archeologists in different parts of the scientific world, and had given rise to numerous works having for their purpose the elucidation of what is generally known as the Pre-Columbian epoch of American history.[2] The manuscripts which Heywood has published from the *Vatican Archives* form almost a complete series of authenticated sources for the history of Norse christianity in America before Columbus. His folio volume containing these documents in photographic facsimiles was a rare work from the beginning, only twenty-five copies being printed. For that reason we reproduce them in these pages in order that all lovers of early Catholic Americana may have them at their disposal.

---

[1] *The Medieval American Church*, article, in the *Catholic University Bulletin*, Vol. i (1895), pp. 415–427.

[2] The most valuable contribution to the subject is RAFN, *Antiquitates Americanarum*. Hafniae, 1837. The best account in English is by DE ROO, *History of America before Columbus*. Two volumes. Philadelphia, 1900. Source material on the same subject will be found in the following works: ADAM BREMENSIS, *Historia seu Gesta Hammaburgensis Ecclsiae* (*Monumenta* of Pertz, *Scriptores*, Vol. vii); BEAMISH, *The Discovery of America by the Northmen*. London, 1841; Id., *Voyages of Northmen to America*, Boston, 1877; BEAUVOIS, *La découverte du Nouveau Monde par les Irlandais et les premières Traces du Christianisme en Amérique avant l'an* 1000, in the *Compte-rendu du Congrès international des Américanistes* at Nancy, 1875; Id., *Origines et Fondation du plus ancien Evêché du Nouveau Monde, le Diocèse de Gardhs en Groenland*, in the *Memoires de la Société d'historie, d'archéologie et de litterature de l'arrondissment de Beaune*, 1878; Id., *La découverte du Groenland par les Scandinaves au X Siècle*, in the *Museon* (Louvain) 1892; Id., *Les derniers vestiges du Christianisme prêché du X au XIV siècles dans la Markland et la Grande Irlande*, Paris, 1877; Id., *La Chrêtienté du Groenland au Moyen Age*, article in *Revue des Questions Historiques* (Vol. lxxi (1902), pp. 538–82), which sums up all his former studies on Medieval America; RICHARD H. CLARKE, *America Discovered and Christianized in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries*, article in the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Vol. xiii (1888), pp. 211–237; Id., *The Conversion of the Northmen. The First Christian Northmen in America*, articles in the ACQR, Vol. xiv (1889), pp. 487–504; 598–615. CRANZ, *History of Greenland*, London, 1820; DE COSTA, *The Pre-Columbian Discovery of America by the Northmen*, 3d ed., Albany, N. Y., 1901; FISKE, *The Discovery of America*, New York, 1902; GRAFFAREL, *Etude sur les Rapports de l'Amérique et de l'Ancien Continent avant Christophe Colomb*, Paris, 1869; GRAVIER, *Decouverte de l'Amérique par les Normands au X siècle*, Paris, 1874; JELIC, *L'Evangelisation de l'Amérique avant Colomb*, Paris, 1891; REEVES, *The Finding of Wineland the Good*, London, 1890; WINSOR, *Narrative and Critical History of America*, Boston, 1869. The best bibliography on the subject will be found in JOSEPH FISCHER, S.J., *The Discoveries of the Norsemen in America with special relation to their early cartographical Representation*. Trans. by B. H. SOULSBY. London, 1903.

I

The "Omnium Fidelium" of Gregory IV

A. D. 835

(Greenland and Iceland placed under the See of Hamburg)

The first document in which the names Iceland and Greenland occur is in the Apostolic confirmation by Pope Gregory IV, in the year 835, of the erection of Hamburg into an archepiscopal See, having jurisdiction over all Scandanavia. This document has been attacked as wholly spurious by Lappenberg, Klempin, and Dümmler, while other writers admit its authenticity but hold that the words *Greenland* and *Iceland* are interpolations.[3] A strong point in favor of the Bull is the number of confirming documents from the Papal See between 835 and 1133.[4] The imperial rescript issued by King Louis the Pious, on May 15, 834, gave to the whole church of Scandanavia an ecclesiastical organization and nominated St. Anschar (801–865), the "Apostle of the North," as its first Bishop, with Hamburg as his episcopal See.[5] In conformity with the royal wish, Gregory IV (827–844), issued the Bull *Omnium Fidelium*, the following year (835), appointing St. Anschar to the See and making him papal legate "to all the surrounding nations"—*in omnibus circumquaque gentibus*—namely, to the Danes, Swedes, Norwegians, Finnlanders, Greenlanders, Helsingers, Icelanders, etc., etc.

Gregorius Episcopus Servus Servorum Dei, Omnium fidelium dignoscentiae certum esse volumus, qualiter beatae memoriae praecellentissimus Rex Karolus, tempore praedecessorum nostrorum, divino afflatus Spiritu, gentem Saxonum sacro cultui subdidit, jugumque Christi, quod suave ac leve est, ad usque terminos Danorum sive Slavorum, corda ferocia ferro perdomans, docuit; ultimamque regni ipsius partem, trans Albiam inter mortifera Paganorum pericula constitutam, videlicet ne ad ritum relaberetur gentilium, vel etiam quia lucrandis adhuc gentibus aptissima videbatur, proprio episcopali vigore fundare decreverat. Sed quia mors affectum prohibuerat, succedente ejus praecellentissimo filio, Hludewico Imperatore Augusto, pium studium sacri genitoris sui efficaciter implevit.

Quae ratio Nobis per venerabiles Ratolphum sive Vernoldum Episcopos, necnon Geroldum comitem vel Missum venerabilem relata est confirmanda.

Nos igitur omnem ibi Deo dignam statutam providentiam cognoscentes, instructi etiam praesentia fratris filiique nostri Anscharii primi Nordalbingorum Archiepiscopi, per manus Drogonis Metensis Episcopi consecrati, sanctum studium magnorum imperatorum, tam praesenti autoritate quam etiam pallii donatione, more praedecessorum nostorum roborare decrevimus; quatenus tanta auctoritate fundatus praedictus filius noster ejusque successores lucrandis fidelibus insistentes, adversus tentamenta diaboli validiores existant, ipsumque filium nostrum jam dictum Anscharium et successores

[3] For a complete discussion on the genuinity of the *Omnium fidelium*, cf., De Roo. *op. cit.*, Vol. pp. 45–67; De Costa, *op. cit.*, pp. 25; Clarke, in the ACQR, Vol. xiv (1889), pp. 598–615.

[4] These confirmatory documents, especially the Papal Briefs of Popes Anastasius III (912), John X (920), and Innocent II (1133), will be found in the original Latin in De Roo, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 527–43.

[5] The Rescript will be found in the *Diplomatarium Islandicum* edited by S. L. Moller, Reykjarik 1857, and in De Roo, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 522–25.

ejus Legatos in omnibus circumquaque gentibus Danorum, Sueonum, Nortwehorum, Farriae, Gronlandan, Halsingolandan, Islandan, Scridevindum, Slavorum, necnon omnium septentrionalium et orientalium nationum quocunque modo nominatarum, delegamus. Et posito capite et pectore super corpus et Confessionem Sancti Petri Apostoli, sibi suisque successoribus vicem nostram perpetuo retinendam, publicam evangelizandi tribuimus auctoritatem, ipsamque sedem Nordalbingorum, Hammaborch dictam, in honore Sancti Salvatoris ejusque intemeratae Genitricis Mariae consecratam, Archiepiscopalem esse decrevimus. Consecrationem vero succedentium sacerdotum donec consecrantium numerus ex gentilibus augeatur, sacrae palatinae providentiae interim committimus. Strenui vero praedicatoris persona tantoque officio apta in successione semper eligatur; omnia vero a venerabili principe ad hoc Deo dignum officium, deputata nostra etiam auctoritate, pia ejus vota firmamus, omnemque resistentem vel contradicentem atque piis nostris his studiis quolibet modo insidiantem, anathematis mucrone percutimus atque perpetua ultione reum diabolica sorte damnamus, ut culmen Apostolicum, more praedecessorum nostrorum, causam Dei pio affectu zelantes, ab adversis hinc inde partibus tutius muniamus.

Et quia te, charissime fili, Anschari, divina clementia nova in sede primum disposuit esse Archiepiscopum, Nos pallium ad missarum solemnia celebranda tribuimus, quod tibi in diebus tuis, uti et Ecclesiae tuae perpetuo statu manentibus privilegiis, uti largimur. Sancta Trinitas vitam tuam conservare dignetur incolumen, atque post saeculi amaritudinem ad perpetuam perducat beatitudinem Amen. (Datum 835).

(*Translation*[6])

Gregory, Bishop, servant of the servants of God; to all the faithful be it known that the most excellent Emperor Charles, in the time of our ancestors, being influenced by inspiration of the Divine Spirit, subdued the race of the Saxons to the Christian religion, and imposed upon them Christ's yoke, which is easy; and that he subdued the fierce hearts as far as the boundaries of the Danes or Slavi, by the sword; and that, in order that the part of the Empire lying beyond the Elbe might not, lying as it did between great perils, go back to the heathen religion, or perhaps because it seemed best adapted to the care of nations yet to be gained over, he so decreed to establish it by his own imperial authority. But death having hindered his plans, his son and most excellent successor, Louis the august Emperor, effectually carried out his father's wishes, which cause is to be confirmed to us by the venerable Racobfius or Vernoldus, Bishop or Count Geroldus. Therefore, all of us recognizing in all this an appointment worthy of Divine Providence, and also instructed by the presence of our good Brother Ansgar, the first bishop of the Nordalbingians, consecrated by the hands of Deago Mateasis Bishop, and the holy seal of honored emperors, both by these presents and by the delivery of the Episcopal Pallium, according to the ancient custom of our forefathers, have resolved to confirm by whatsoever valid authority we possess, the said Ansgarius and his successors in office, in order that in winning over the nations they may be the more mighty against the wiles of the Devil, and they are hereby appointed over Legates Apostolic among all the nations round about—the Danes, Swedes, Norwegians, Faroese, Greenlanders, Helsingers, Ice-

[6] Da Costa, *op. cit.*, pp. 219–220.

landers, Slavi, as also all the northern and eastern nations of whatever name they may be called, and resting head and heart upon the body of the faith of St. Peter, we give them public authority to preach the Gospel, and to occupy the Episcopal See itself. We decree that the See of the Nordalbingians, called Hamburg, shall be consecrated in honor of the Saviour and His Immaculate Mother as an Archi-episcopal See. And until the number of bishops shall be increased, we commit the consecration of bishops, provisionally, to the care of the Palatinate. But let the person elected for so great an office and apt thereto, always be that of an earnest preacher, that we do by our authority confirm and establish his pious wishes and vows; and everyone who shall resist or gainsay, or in any way counteract these auspicious desires, we do smite with the sharp edge of our anathema and adjudge the guilty by perpetual vengeance to the doom of devils, according to the manner of predecessors in office; and being zealous with pious effort, do all the more safely defend the Apostolic See against all adversaries.

And forasmuch, most beloved Ansgar, the Divine Grace has inclined thee in this new See to accept the office of an archbishop, we do hereby transmit the pallium for your celebration of the mass, which we authorize you to wear during your lifetime.

May it please the most Holy Trinity long to spare your life, and after the bitterness of this transitory state may you obtain eternal felicity. Amen. Datum, 835.

II

The See of Gardar in Greenland was erected in 1125, and with it begins what may be called the Medieval Epoch of American History. From 1125 until the year of the Discovery, 1492, a long line of Bishops rule this far-away northern Diocese. The *Heywood Documents* contain ten papal letters on the subject, and are here given in their proper order.

1

Innocent III to Thorer, Archbishop Elect of Drontheim, February 13, 1206

(Giving Him Metropolitan Jurisdiction over All Scandinavia)

..Nidrosiensi archiepiscopo eiusque successoribus canonice substituendis, in perpetuum. Licet omnibus ligandi et solvendi sit concessa potestas, licet unum preceptum ad omnes idemque pervenerit predicandi evangelium omni creature, velut quedam tamen inter eas habita est discretio dignitatis et dominicarum ovium curam, que omnibus imminebat, unus singulariter suscepit habendam, dicente ad eum Domino: Petre amas me? Pasce oves meas. Qui etiam inter omnes apostolos principatus nomen obtinuit, et de fratrum confirmatione singulare a Domino preceptum accepit, ut in hoc secuture posteritati daretur intelligi, quoniam, quamvis multos ad regimen ecclesie contingeret ordinari, unus tamen solummodo supreme dignitatis locum fastigiumque teneret, et unus omnibus et potestate gubernandi et iudicandi omnes presideret. Unde et secundum hanc formam in ecclesia distinctio servata est dignitatum, et sicut in humano corpore pro varietate officiorum diversa ordinata sunt membra, ita in structura ecclesie ad diversa ministeria exhibenda diverse persone in diversis sunt ordinibus constitute. Aliis enim ad singularum ecclesiarum, aliis autem ad singularum urbium dispositionem ordinatis ac rerum, constituti sunt in singulis provinciis alii,

quorum prima inter fratres sententia habeatur, et ad quorum examen subiectarum personarum questiones et negocia referantur. Super omnes autem Romanus pontifex tamquam Noe in archa primum locum noscitur obtinere, qui ex collato sibi desuper in apostolorum principe privilegio de universorum causis iudicat et disponit et per universum orbem ecclesie filios in christiane fidei firmitate non desinit confirmare, talem se curans iugiter exhibere, qui vocem dominicam videatur audisse, qua dicitur: Et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos. Hoc nimirum post beatum Petrum illi apostoli et viri, qui per successiones temporum ad gerendam curam sedis apostolice surrexerunt indesinenti curaverunt studio adimplere et per universum orbem nunc per se nunc per legatos suos corrigenda corrigere et statuenda statuere summopere studuerunt. Quorum quoque vestigia subsecutus felicis memorie Eugenius papa, antecessor noster, de corrigendis hiis, que in regno Norweie correctionem videbantur exposcere et verbo ibi fidei seminando iuxta sui officii debitum sollicitus extitit, et quod per se ipsum, universalis ecclesie cura obsistente, non potuit, per legatum suum Nicholaum, tunc scilicet Albanensem episcopum, qui postea in Romanum pontificem est assumptus, executioni mandavit. Qui ad partes accedens, sicut a suo patrefamilias acceperat in mandatis, talentum sibi creditum largitus est ad usuram et tamquam fidelis servus et prudens, multiplicatum inde fructum studuit reportare. Inter cetera vero, que ad laudem illic nominis Dei et ministerii sui commendationem implevit, iuxta quod predictus antecessor noster ei preceperat, palleum Iohannia antecessori tuo indulsit et, ne de cetero provincie Norweie metropolitani cura possit deesse, commissam gubernationi tue urbem Nidrosiensem eiusdem provincie perpetuam metropolim ordinavit et ei Asloensem, Amatripiensem, Bargensem, Stavangriensem, insulas Orcades, insulas Farcie, Sutrhaie et Islandensem et Grenelandie episcopatus tamquam sue metropoli perpetuis temporibus constituit subiacere et eorum episcopos sicut metropolitanis suis tam sibi quam suis successoribus obedire. Ne igitur ad violentiam constitutionis ipsius ulli unquam liceat aspirare, nos felicis memorie predicti Eugenii et Alexandri atque Clementis predecessorum nostrorum Romanorum pontificum vestigiis inherentes, eandem constitutionem auctoritate apostolica confirmamus et presentis scripti privilegio communimus, statuentes ut Nidrosiensis civitas supradictarum urbium perpetuis temporibus metropolis habeatur, et earum episcopi tam tibi quam tuis successoribus sicut suo metropolitano obediant et de manu vestra consecrationis gratiam sortiantur, successores autem tui ad Romanum pontificem tantum percepturi donum consecrationis accedant, et ei solummodo et Romane ecclesie subiecti semper existant. Porro concesso tibi palleo pontificalis scilicet officii plenitudine infra ecclesiam tantum ad sacra missarum sollempnia per universam provinciam tuam hiis solummodo diebus uti fraternitas tua debebit, qui inferius leguntur inscripti: Nativitate Domini, Epiphania, Cena Domini, Resurrectione, Ascensione, Pentecoste, in sollempnitatibus beate Dei Genitricis semperque virginis Marie, Natalicio beatorum Petri et Pauli, Inventione et Exaltatione sancte Crucis, Nativitate beati Ioannis baptiste, festo beati Iohannis evangeliste, Commemoratione omnium sanctorum, in consecrationibus ecclesiarum vel episcoporum, benedictionibus abbatum, ordinationibus presbiterorum, in die consecrationis ecclesie tue ac festis sancte Trinitatis, et sancti Olavi et anniversario tue consecrationis die. Studeat ergo tua fraternitas plenitudine tante dignitatis suscepta ita strenue cuncta peragere, quatinus morum tuorum ornamenta eidem valeant convenire.

Sit vita tua subditis exemplum, ut per vam cognoscant, quid debeant appetere, quid cogantur vitare; esto discretione precipuus, cogitatione mundus, actione purus, discretus in silentio, utilis in verbo, cura tibi sit magis prodesse hominibus quam preesse. Non in te potestatem ordinis, sed equalitatem oportet pensare conditionis. Stude ne vita doctrinam destituat, nec cursum vite doctrina contradicat. Memento quod est ars artium regimen animarum. Super omnia studium tibi sit apostolice sedis decreta firmiter observare et tamquam matri et domine tue ei humiliter obedire. Ecce frater in Christo karissime inter multa alia hec sunt pallei, hec sacerdotii, que omnia facile Christo adiuvante adimplere poteris, si virtutum omnium magistram caritatem habueris et humilitatem, et quod foris habere ostenderis intus habebis. Decernimus ergo et c. usque in finem. Dat. Rome apud Sanctum Petrum per manus Ioannis, Sancte Marie in Cosmedin diaconi cardinalis, sancte Romane ecclesie cancellarii, idibus februarii, indictione vj, incarnationis dominice anno M°CC°V°, pontificatus vero domini Innocentii pape iij anno octavo.[7]

(*Translation*[8])

Innocent III, to the Archbishop of Drontheim, and his canonically appointed successors in perpetuity: Though the power of binding and loosing was given to all, and although the same common command to preach the Gospel to every creature was laid upon all, a certain distinction of dignity was nevertheless decreed and only one received above all others the care of the Lord's sheep, in accordance with the Lord's words: Peter, dost thou love me? Feed my sheep. It was Peter also who attained to the preeminence above all the Apostles. He received a particular command from the Lord to confirm his brethren, that following generations might know that while many were ordained to govern the Church only one was to hold the supreme power, and be over all the others in authority and jurisdiction. Therefore, in accordance with this plan, a distinction of power is seen in the Church, and even as in the human body the various members thereof are intended for different uses, so in the Church different persons attain to different orders for different services. Some are set apart for particular churches and some are ordained to the rule of different cities, and the arrangement of different affairs. Others are set over certain provinces, others have jurisdiction over their brethren for the disposition of cases that relate to those under them. But over all these, the Roman Pontiff, like Noah in the ark, as holding the preeminence; for he, by virtue of the power granted to him from above in the person of the prince of the Apostles, judges and decides causes, and ceases not to establish in the Christian faith the sons of the church all over the world, by right seeking to prove that he has heard the voice of the Lord, saying: And thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren. The Apostles and men who have risen in regular order to the government of the apostolic see since the blessed Peter, have likewise endeavored with unfailing zeal to perform the same, and either personally or by means of their legates have endeavored to their utmost to correct whatever needed correction and to decree what was required. Our predecessor of happy memory, Pope Eugene, following in their footsteps, was desirous, in accordance with the obligations of his office, to amend in the kingdom of Norway all that seemed to demand amendment, by sowing the word of faith, and what he himself was unable

[7] Cf. BREQUIGNY, *Diplomata*, Paris, 1791, tom. ii, 2 p., p. 834 and MIGNE, *Patrologia Latina*, tom. ccxv, c. 798.

[8] DA COSTA, *op. cit.*, pp. 205–6.

to do, on account of his care of the universal Church, he entrusted for execution to his legate Nicholas, then bishop of Albano and afterwards Roman pontiff, who, having gone to that country, loaned out, obedient to the commands of his master, the talent he had received, and like a faithful and wise servant tried to derive an increase thereof. Among other things which he achieved to the glory of God's name and his ministry, according as he had been ordered by our said predecessor, he bestowed the pallium upon thy predecessor John, and lest the province of Norway should lack the direction of a metropolitan he appointed the city of Nidras, now under thy charge, as the metropolitan See in perpetuity of the said province and gave to it as suffrage Sees in perpetuity Aslo, Amatrip, Bergen, Stavangri, the Orkney, Faroe, and Subraic islands, Iceland and Greenland, commanding the bishops of the same to obey him and his successors as their metropolitans. Lest anyone should presume, however, to violate the order of the aforesaid legate, we, after the example of the aforementioned Eugene, of happy memory, of Alexander and of Clement, our predecessors and Roman pontiffs, confirm the same order by apostolic authority, and by this ordinance ordering that the city of Nidras be ever considered as the metropolitan See of the aforementioned cities; that their bishops are to obey thee and thy successors as their metropolitan, and to receive from thy hands the grace of consecration; that thy successors, however, are to come to the Roman pontiff alone, in order to receive the grace of consecration, and that they are to be subject to the Roman Church alone. Besides, thy fraternity will use the pallium which has been given thee, the emblem of the fullness of the pontifical office, within church only during the solemn celebration of mass throughout thy whole province, and on those days only which are underwritten, viz., the Lord's nativity, the Epiphany, the Lord's Supper, the Resurrection, Ascension and Pentecost, on the festivals of the blessed Mother of God, Mary, ever virgin; the feasts of Saints Peter and Paul, the finding and exaltation of the Holy Cross, the nativity of St. John the Baptist, the feast of blessed John the Evangelist, on the commemoration of all saints, when consecrating churches or bishops, blessing abbots or ordaining priests, on the anniversary of the consecration of thy own church, the feasts of the Holy Trinity and of St. Olaf and the anniversary of thy consecration. Wherefore let thy fraternity do all things with diligence that the ornaments of thy administration may be in keeping with the fullness of the great dignity thou hast received. Let thy life be an example to all who are under thee, so that they may learn therefrom what they should seek after and what they are obliged to shun; be distinguished for thy prudence, chasteness of thought, purity of conduct, discretion in silence, usefulness in speech. Endeavor rather to do good to men than to rule them. In thyself thou shouldst consider not the power of order, but the equality of thy condition. Take care lest thy life render void thy teaching or thy teaching prove in contradiction to thy conduct. Remember that the government of souls is the art of arts. Strive above all things to observe faithfully the decrees of the apostolic see, and humbly obey the same as thy mother and mistress. These, most beloved brother in Christ, are some among the many obligations which pertain to thy archiepiscopal and sacerdotal office, all of which thou canst easily perform with Christ's aid, provided that thou hast charity, which is the mother of all virtues, and humility, and that thou hast inwardly what thou seemest outwardly to have.

Accordingly we decree, etc., unto the end.

Done in Rome, at St. Peter's, by the hand of John, cardinal, deacon of St. Mary's in Cosmedin, chancellor of the holy Roman church, on the thirteenth day of February, the sixth indiction, in the year of the Lord's Incarnation 1205, and the eighth year of the pontificate of Pope Innocent III.

2-5

John XXI to Archbishop John Rufus of Drontheim

(December 4, 1276)

(Tithes, Peter's Pence)

2

. . Archiepiscopo Nidrosiensi. Tua nobis fraternitas intimavit, quod, cum tibi collectio decime Terre Sancte in regno Norwagie per litteras apostolicas sit commissum et in litteris ipsis contineatur expresse, ut omnes partes eiusdem regni debeas propter hoc personaliter visitare, idque quodammodo impossibile videatur, cum Gardensis diocesis, que de tua provincia et regno existit eodem, a metropolitana ecclesia adeo sit remota, quod de ipsa ecclesia illuc propter maris impedimenta vix infra quinquennium ire quis valeat et redire ad ecclesiam supradictam, ac ideo dubites, quod adhuc infra temporis spatium ad solutionem ipsius decime constituti apostolicum sive tuum ad partes illas non valeat pervenire mandatum; postulasti super hoc per apostolice sedis providentiam remedium adhiberi. Cupientes igitur, ut collectioni eiusdem decime sollicitis studiis intendatur, volumus et fraternitati tue per apostolica scripta mandamus, quatinus, si premissa veritas comitetur, aliquas personas ydoneas et fideles, super quibus tuam intendimus conscientiam onerare, ad partes illas destinare procures, que ad executionem collectionis eiusdem diligenter invigilent et intendant aliasque super hoc providere studeas, prout utilitati eiusdem decime videris expedire; nichilominus ad collectionem huiusmodi per te ipsum operose sollicitudinis studium impensurus, ita quod proinde tibi a Domino premium compares et sedis apostolice gratiam uberius merearis. Dat. Viterbii secundo nonas decembris, anno primo.

(Translation[1]*)*

John XXI to the archbishop of Drontheim:

Having received, by apostolic brief, the commission to collect tithes in the kingdom of Norway for the Holy Land, and having been expressly commanded in the same brief to visit in person all the countries of the said kingdom for this purpose, thy fraternity informs us that such visitation seems in a measure impossible, for the diocese of Gardar, which belongs to thy province and kingdom, is so far from the metropolitan see and the difficulties of navigation are so great that five years are scarcely sufficient for the whole journey; therefore, thou hast reason to doubt whether the apostolic mandate or thine will reach the said country within the time named for the payment of the tithes. Therefore, thou hast had recourse to the wisdom of the Apostolic See for a remedy in this matter. We, therefore, in our desire that the collection of the tithes be carefully attended to, do wish and by apostolic letters command thy fraternity, the above facts being true, to appoint certain capable and faithful persons, regarding whom we charge thy conscience, who shall visit that country and shall supervise and diligently superintend the said collection. Thou shalt also carefully provide whatsoever shall seem desirable in the said matter, that thou mayest obtain thy reward of the Lord and merit for thyself more abundantly the favor of the apostolic see.

Done at Viterbo, December 4th, in the first year.

---

[1] DA COSTA, *op. cit.*, pp. 208–9.

3

Tua nobis et c. usque in regno Norwagie sit commissa per sedis apostolice litteras speciales, et in eis contineatur expresse, ut omnes eiusdem regni partes debeas propter hoc personaliter visitare, ac plures dioceses in regno ipso tuaque provincia constitute per maris spatia adeo sint disperse ac intra suos limites dilatate, quod fere infra sex annos et absque gravissimo ecclesie tue dispendio partes omnes predictarum personaliter visitare diocesum difficile tibi foret, cum nonnunquam per dietas quinque ac plures etiam te per talia loca procedere oporteret, in quibus ob domorum defectum tecum deferre tentoria cogereris, concedi tibi, ut per easdem dioceses super collectione ipsius decime certos nuntios tuos ydoneos et discretos, mandato apostolico contrario non obstante, deputare valeas postulasti. Nos itaque tua et ecclesie tue dispendia evitantes, tibi, ut, si premissis veris existentibus expedire videris, super quo tuam intendimus conscientiam onerare, nuntios huiusmodi per easdem dioceses super ipsius decime collectione deputare valeas, tenore presentium duximus concedendum; volentes nichilominus, ut tu illas ex predictis diocesibus personaliter visites, quas absque magno incomodo poteris visitare, sollicitum studium adhibens circa colletionem decime supradicte, ita quod exinde premium expectes a Domino, cuius negotium agitur, et favorem apostolicum uberius merearius. Dat. ut supra.

(*Translation*[10])

By apostolic brief you have received a commission to collect tithes in the kingdom of Norway for the Holy Land, and having been commanded in the same brief to visit in person all the countries of the said country for this purpose, but thy fraternity has informed us that several of the dioceses in that kingdom belonging to thy province are so widely scattered over the sea and so extensive in territory that it would be difficult for thee to visit personally all the districts of the said dioceses within a period of about six years and without heavy expense to thy see, and since thou wouldst have to journey some five or more seasons through countries where, because there are no dwellings, thou wouldst be obliged to carry tents, thou hast asked to be authorized to depute, notwithstanding the apostolic brief to the contrary, certain careful and capable commissaries to collect the tithes in the said countries. Wherefore, in order to spare thee and thy see such expense, we have concluded to allow thee, by tenor of these present, liberty to appoint such commissaries for the collection of tithes in the said diocese, in case the above be according to the facts, and if thou seest fit so to do, regarding which we charge thy conscience. We wish thee, nevertheless, to visit in person such of the aforesaid dioceses as may be possible, without great inconvenience, and to attend to the collection of the said tithes, that thou mayest expect a recompense from the Lord, whose work it is, and mayest more abundantly merit the favor of the apostolic see.

Done at Viterbo, December 4th, in the first year.

4

Intimasti nobis, quod, cum propter nimiam episcopatuum diffusionem regni Norwagie, in quo tibi per apostolicas litteras collectio decime Terre Sancte deputate subsidio est commissa, duo collectores iuxta promissionem (*l. permissionem*) apostolice sedis in qualibet diocesi ordinati nequaquam

[10] Da Costa, *op. cit.*, pp. 209–10.

sufficiant ad ipsam decimam colligendam, neo per illos posset comode colligi absque magno profluvio expensarum, tu cum consilio et assensu suffraganeorum tuorum ipsius regni pro huiusmodi utilitate negotii statuisti per rura singularum diocesum plures alios collectores, qui suis laboribus et expensis predictam decimam colligant et collectam statutis temporibus duobus collectoribus deferant, qui sunt in civitatibus deputati, unde nobis humiliter supplicasti, ut eorundem collectorum rularium (*l. ruralium*) labores et sumptus benigna meditatione pensantes, aliquam illis indulgentiam concedere curaremus. Volentes itaque, ut iidem collectores rurales fructum ex suis laboribus et sumptibus consequantur, eis illam indulgentiam impartimur, que ad promotionem negotii Terre Sancte opem et operam exhibentibus est concessa. Dat. ut supra.

(*Translation*[11])

Thou hast informed us that, owing to the great extent of the dioceses in the kingdom of Norway, wherein thou hast been appointed by apostolic letter collector of tithes for the relief of the Holy Land, the two collectors named, with apostolic permission, for every diocese, are not enough for the said work, nor can they perform the matter without inconvenience and very great cost. By the advice and with the assent of thy suffragans in the said kingdom, thou hast appointed for the rural districts of the different dioceses several other collectors, who by their own efforts and at their personal cost are to collect the tithes and then convey them to the two city collectors. Therefore, thou hast humbly besought us to regard the labor and cost to which these collectors put themselves and to grant them some relief; hence, as we desire that these rural collectors may gain some advantage from their labors and expense, we grant them the indulgence which has been accorded to those who by their labors and cooperation further the cause of the Holy Land.

At Viterbo, December 4th, in the first year.

5

Intimasti nobis, quod in regno Norwagie, in quo tibi decime Terre Sancte collectio est commissa, usque adeo vilis esse moneta dinoscitur usualis, quod extra ipsius regni limites in pretio non habetur, quodque in quibusdam partibus dicti regni monete usus aliquis non existit nec crescunt segetes neque frugum alia genera producuntur, sed lacticiniis et piscibus fere dumtaxat vita inibi sustentatur humana. Quare significari tibi a nobis humiliter petivisti, quid de decima, que de lacticiniis et piscibus et moneta predictis colligitur, debeas ordinare. Nos igitur ad ea, que sunt utiliora negotio intendentes expedire videmus, ut, premissis veris existentibus, in aurum vel argentum, prout commodius fieri poterit, huiusmodi moneta et decima convertantur. De monialibus autem et personis aliis regularibus dicti regni, quorum proventus et redditus ecclesiastici adeo sunt tenues et exiles, quod ex illis sustentari non possunt, sed pro habenda vite sue substentatione necesse habeant publice mendicare et helemosinas petere, servare poteris, quod in declarationibus super ipsius decime editis plenius continetur. Dat. ut supra.[12]

---

[11] Da Costa, *op. cit.*, p. 210.

[12] Cf. Munch, *Pavelige Nuntiers Regnskabs og Dagboger, forte under Tiende-Opkraevningen i Norden* 1282–1334, p. 143. Christiania. 1864.

(*Translation*[13])

Thou hast informed us that in the kingdom of Norway, where thou hast been entrusted with the collection of tithes for the Holy Land, the current money is so debased as to be of no value outside the boundaries of the kingdom, and that in some parts of the aforesaid kingdom money is not in use, also no crops are cultivated, and no fruits are grown, the people living almost entirely upon milk, cheese and fish; therefore, thou hast humbly requested us to tell thee what thou shalt do with the tithes drawn from the aforesaid milk, cheese, fish and money. Therefore, in our thought that whatever is most profitable to be done in this matter, we think it would be well, if the statement be exact, to exchange so far as practicable all such coin and tithes for silver and gold. In regard to the nuns and other religious orders of the kingdom whose incomes and ecclesiastical revenues are so small as to be insufficient for their support, thou canst proceed according to that which has been set forth fuller in the declarations relating to this collection of tithes.

Done at Viterbo, December 4th, first year.

6

Nicholas III to Archbishop of Drontheim (January 31, 1279)

Venerabili fratri . . . archiepiscopo Nidrosiensi. Ex transmissa nobis nuper tuarum collegimus serie litterarum, quod insula, in qua civitas Cardensis consistit, propter malitiam maris Occeani, infra quod ipsa consistit, raro navigio visitantur; unde, cum nuper quidam naute ad eiusdem insule visitationem tenderent vela in altum, tu huiusmodi oportunitate captata quendam discretum virum, colligendi decimam commisso sibi officio, cum dictis nautis ad civitatem transmissisti eandem, et sub spe nostre ratificationis concessisti eidem, ut clericos ab excommunicationis sententia, quam pro eo quod huiusmodi decimam in statutis super hoc terminis non solverunt incurrerant, absolveret et cum eis dispensaret super irregularitate, si quam proinde forsitan contraxerunt. Quare a nobis humiliter postulasti, ut ratificare benignius dignaremur. Cum itaque huiusmodi postulationi, ut pote que rationis viribus non iuvatur. (*l. iuvatur, non*) acquiescere favorabiliter nequeamus, ac propter hoc cupientes huiusmodi tuis desideriis annuere et animarum periculis per consequens occurrere provisionis remedio salutaris, presentium tibi auctoritate commictimus, ut absolvendi clericos tam in predicta quam aliis insulis maris eiusdem constitutos a predicta sententia iuxta formam ecclesie et dispensandi cum eis super irregularitate huiusmodi libere commictere valeas officium hiis, quos propter collectionis ministerium ad predictas insulas destinasti vel forsitan imposterum destinabis. Dat. Rome apud Sanctum Petrum secundo kalendas februarii, anno secundo.

Eidem magistro Bertrando Amalricii.

Dat. Rome apud Sanctum Petrum v idus iunii, anno secundo.[14]

(*Translation*[15])

Nicholas III, to his venerable brother, the Archbishop of Drontheim:

We have learned from thy letters to us, that the island on which the city of Gardar is located is not often visited by ships, on account of the storms of the ocean where

[13] Da Costa, *op. cit.*, pp. 210–11.
[14] Cf. Munch, *l. c.*, p. 146.
[15] Da Costa, *op. cit.*, pp. 211–12.

it is situated. Lately, therefore, when certain sailors went to the said island to the said city, thou didst take advantage of the opportunity to send in the company of the said sailors, a careful person, whom thou didst appoint collector of the tithes. Depending upon our approbation thou didst empower him to absolve clerics from the pain of excommunication which had fallen upon them, on account of non-payment of tithes within the ordered time, and to release them from whatever irregularity they may have committed. Therefore, thou hast humbly requested us to grant our gracious approval. But since we cannot favorably assent to this desire because it is not based on reason, and desiring, on this account, to comply with thy wishes by applying a ready remedy for perils to souls, we hereby empower thee to give to those whom thou hast sent or may send in the future to the said islands to absolve clerics, whether in the aforementioned islands or others in the same ocean from the aforesaid sentence according to the order of the Church, and to dispense them from irregularity of this kind.

Done at Rome, at St. Peter's, January 31, 1279.

7

Nicholas III to Bertrand Arnabrie

(June 9, 1279)

Te nuper significante accepimus, quod in cathedralibus ecclesiis in Datie et Suetie regnis constitutis nonnulli redditus devotione fidelium deputati existunt, ex quibus per personam ad hoc specialiter deputatam clericis ecclesiarum infra eadem regna consistentium vinum et ostie annis singulis ministrantur. Quia vero, an de huiusmodi redditibus exigi debeat decima, consultationem a sede apostolica postulasti, nos tuam diligentiam commendantes discretioni tue per apostolica scripta mandamus, quatinus, si proventus ipsi sint adeo magni, quod ministratis vino et ostiis multum ex illis noveris superesse, volumus, quod de illis huiusmodi decima persolvatur; si vero nihil vel parum ex predictis redditibus superesset, nichil persolvatur de ipsis propter reverentiam divini cultus et Domini sacramentum. Dat. ut supra. (Rome apud Sanctum Petrum v idus iunii, anno secundo.)[16]

(*Translation*[17])

"Nicholas III, to the said Master Bertrand Arnabrie:

We have recently been told by thee that certain revenues have been apportioned by the devotion of the faithful in the cathedral churches of Denmark and Sweden for the express purpose of buying wine and altar bread for the clergy of the churches within the said kingdom. Since, however, thou hast consulted the Apostolic See in regard to whether tithes should be taken from revenues of this kind, while approving thy diligence, we do by apostolic letter leave the question to thy judgment, in order that, if the revenues be so large that thou art sure that a large sum will be left over after providing wine and altar bread, we wish that tithes be paid on that part. On the other hand, if little or nothing is left of the said revenues, nothing is to be paid out of regard for reverence for adoration and the sacrament of the Lord.

Done in Rome, at St. Peter's, June 9, 1279."

---

[16] Cf. MUNCH, *l. c.*, p. 150.

[17] DA COSTA, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

8

Martin IV to Archbishop of Drontheim

(March 4, 1281)

Venerabili fratri . . . archiepiscopo Nidrosiensi. Tua nobis fraternitas intimavit, quod decima, que in Islandie et Feroyum insulis in regno Norwegie constitutis in diversis rebus persolvitur, que de facili permutari vel pecunialiter vendi non possunt, propter quod decima eadem nequit ad Terram Sanctam vel ad sedem apostolicam comode destinari. Subiuncxisti quoque, quod Gronlandie decima non percipitur nisi in bovinis et focarum coriis ac dentibus et funibus balenarum, que, sicut asseris, vix ad competens pretium vendi possunt. Unde, quid super premissis a te agendum existat, petiisti te per apostolice sedis oraculum edoceri. Nos itaque tue sollicitudinis studium commendantes, consultationi tue taliter respondemus, quod tam insularum quam Gronlandie decimas predictarum in argentum vel aurum, prout melius et utilius fieri poterit, convertere studeas, illud una cum (illa) alia decima in ipso regno collecta pro ipsius Terre subsidio ad apostolicam sedem, quamcito poteris, transmissurus, quid et quantum destinaveris fideliter intimando. Ceterum carissimo in Christo filio nostro . . . regi Norwegie illustri nostras regatorias litteras destinavimus, ut non impediat nec impediri permittat, quin decima ipsa de regno suo libere extrahatur in predicte Terre subsidium secundum apostolice sedis arbitrium disponenda, quodque prohibitionem contra eiusdem clericos regni factam, ne quivis laicus ipsius regni sterlingos vel argentum aliud vendere quoquomodo presumat, studeat difficultate summota qualibet revocare. Dat. apud Urbemveterem 1111 nonas martii, anno primo.[18]

(*Translation*[19])

Thy fraternity hast informed us that the tithes being paid in Iceland and the Faroe Islands in the kingdom of Norway, are composed of various commodities that cannot easily be exchanged or sold, on which account the same cannot readily be sent to Holy Land or to the Apostolic See. Thou hast said, also, that the only tithes that can be gathered in Greenland are composed of skins of the elk or the musk ox or of seals, teeth ropes of whales, which by your account, cannot be sold for any fair price. Therefore, thou hast desired instructions of the apostolic see as to what course you should take in this case. Therefore, while we admire thy pious care, we reply to the question as follows: Thou must seek to exchange the tithes of Greenland and the other islands as you best may, for either silver or gold and forward the same as soon as possible, together with other tithes collected in the kingdom for the succour of Holy Land, truly informing us in regard to the nature and the amount of what thou dost send. We also write to our most dear son in Christ, the renowned king of Norway, requesting him not to prevent or permit anyone to prevent the free exportation from his dominion of the tithes which are devoted, as the Apostolic See shall deem fitting to the succour of the said Holy Land, and to seek to repeal the order decreed against clerics of said kingdom, that forbids any layman of the kingdom selling easterlings or other silver.

Done at Orvieto, March 4, 1281.

---

[18] Cf. MUNCH., *l. c.*, p. 153.

[19] DA COSTA, *op. cit.*, p. 212–13.

9

Nicholas V to the Bishops of Skalholt and Holar in Iceland

(September 25, 1448)

(Ruin of the Diocese)

Nicolaus etc. venerabilibus fratribus Schaoltensi et Olensi episcopis salutem etc. Ex iniuncto nobis desuper apostolice servitutis officio universarum ecclesiarum regimini presidentes, sic auctore domino pro animarum salute precioso Salvatoris redemptas comertio nostre solicitudinis curam impendimus, ut illam non solum impietatis et errorum procellis sepius fluctuantes, sed et erumnis et persecutionum turbinibus involutas ad statum optime tranquillitatis reducere studeamus. Sane pro parte dilectorum filiorum indigenarum et universitatis habitatorum insule Grenolandie, que in ultimis finibus Occeani ad septemtrionalem plagam regni Norwegie in provincia Nidrosiensi dicitur situata, lacrimabilis querela nostrum turbavit auditum, amaricavit et mentem, quod in ipsam insulam, cuius habitatores et incole ab annis fere sexcentis Christi fidem gloriosi sui preconis beati Olavi regis predicatione susceptam, firmam et intemeratam sub sancte Romane ecclesie et sedis apostolice institutis servarunt, ac quod tempore succedente in dicta insula populis assidua devotione flagrantibus, sanctorum edes quamplurime et insignis ecclesia cathedralis erecte fuerint, in quibus divinus cultus sedulo agebatur, donec, illo permictente, qui imperscrutabili sapiencie et science sue scrutinio persepe, quos diligit, temporaliter corrigit et ad meliorem emendam casgat, ex finitimis lictoribus paganorum ante annos triginta classe navali barbari insurgentes, cunctum habitatorum ibidem populum crudeli invasione aggressi et ipsam patriam edesque sacras igne et gladio devastantes solis [*in*] insula novem relictis ecclesiis parrochialibus, que latissimis dicitur extendi terminis, quas propter crepidines montium commode adire non poterant, miserandos utriusque sexus indigenas, illos precipue quos ad subeundum perpetue onera servitutis aptos videbant et fortes, tanquam ipsorum tyrannidi accomodatos, ad propria vexerunt captivos. Verum quia, sicut eadem querela subiungebat, post temporis successum quamplurimi ex captivitate predicta redeuntes ad propria et refectis hinc inde locorum ruinis, divinum cultum possetenus ad instar dispositionis pristine ampliare et instaurare desiderent, et quia propter preteritarum calamitatum pressuras fame et inedia laborantibus non suppetebat hucusque facultas presbiteros nutriendi et presulem, toto illo triginta annorum tempore episcopi solatio et sacerdotum ministerio caruerunt, nisi quis per longissimam dierum et locorum distanciam divinorum desiderio officiorum ad illas se conferre valuisset ecclesias, quas manus barbarica illesas pretermisit, nobis humiliter supplicari fecerunt, quatinus eorum pio et salutari proposito paterna miseratione cucurrere [*l. succurrere*] et ipsorum in spiritualibus supplere defectus nostrumque et apostolice sedis in premissis favorem impartiri benivolum dignaremur. Nos igitur dictorum indigenarum et universitatis habitatorum prefate insule Grenolandie iustis et honestis precibus et desideriis inclinati, de premissis et eorum circumstanciis certam noticiam non habentes, fraternitati vestre, quos ex vicinioribus episcopis insule prefate esse intelleximus, per apostolica scripta commictimus et mandamus, quatinus vos vel alter vestrum diligenti examine auditis et intellectis premissis, si ea veritate fulciri compereritis ipsumque populum et indigenas numero et facultatibus adeo

suffitienter esse resumptos, quod id pro nunc expedire videbitis, quod ipsi affectare videntur, de sacerdotibus ydoneis et exemplari vita preditis ordinandi et providendi plebanos et rectores instituendi, qui parrocchias et ecclesias resarcitas gubernent, sacramenta ministrent et, si vobis sive alteri vestrum demum expedire videbitur et opportunum, requisito ad hoc metropolitani consilio, si loci distancia patietur, personam utilem et ydoneam, nostram et sedis apostolice communionem habentem, eis in episcopum ordinare et instituere ac sibi munus consecrationis in forma ecclesie consueta, nomine nostro impendere et administracionem spiritualium et temporalium concedere, recepto ab eodem prius iuramento nobis et Romane ecclesie debito et consueto, valeatis vel alter vestrum valeat; super quibus omnibus vestram conscienciam oneramus, plenam et liberam vobis vel alteri vestrum constitucionibus apostolicis et generalium conciliorum ac aliis in contrarium editis non obstantibus quibuscunque. Dat. Rome apud Sanctam Potencianam, anno etc. millesimo quadringentesimo quadragesimo octavo, duodecimo kalendas octobris, pontificatus nostri anno secundo.[20]

(*Translation*[21])

"Nicholas, etc., to our venerable brothers, Bishop of Skalholt and Bishop of Holar, Health, etc.:

By virtue of the apostolic charge given to us from on high, in directing the affairs of the universal church, it is our care, in God's name, to secure the salvation of souls purchased by the precious blood of our Saviour, not only by stilling the storms of irreligion and error which sweep over them, but also by protecting them when subject to misfortunes and whirlwinds of persecution. From the natives and from dwellers in Greenland, an island said to be found in the most distant parts of the ocean off the northern coasts of the kingdom of Norway, in the province of Drontheim, a sorrowful cry has come to our ears and saddened our heart. These people, nearly six hundred years ago, received the Faith from the lips of their glorious apostle, the blessed King Olaf, and kept it unchanged and pure, in obedience to the laws of the holy Roman Church and the Apostolic See. After a time animated by unfailing devotion, they built many churches besides a fine cathedral, in which the worship of God was faithfully carried on until within thirty years, by the permission of Him who, in his incomprehensible wisdom and knowledge, afflicts those whom He loves to make them perfect, barbarous people from the neighboring heathen shores sent ships to invade the island. The land was laid waste with fire and sword, churches were everywhere destroyed in all the island, said to be of vast extent. Only nine parish churches escaped, for the reason that being built among the mountains they could not well be reached. Many of the unhappy people of both sexes, who seemed strong to bear the yoke of lasting slavery, and by reason of physical strength appearing best suited for the labors of their masters, were carried away as prisoners. Nevertheless, the same adds, that, after a time, many of them returned to their native country; and having in various places rebuilt what the invaders had destroyed, they wished to establish the worship of God and restore its former splendor. Nevertheless, the misfortunes endured had left them in such a starving and necessitous condition, that they had no means of supporting a bishop and priests, and unless in their desire for Divine worship they could perform a journey of a number of days to the churches

[20] Cf. *Grönlands historiske Mindesmaerker*, tom III, pp. 164–74, Copenhagen, 1845, UNGER og HUITFELDT, *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, tom. VI, n. 527. Christiania, 1864.

[21] DA COSTA, *op. cit.*, pp. 214–16.

that had survived the destruction of the barbarians, they were without the comforts of a pastor and the services of priests for thirty years. Therefore, they have most humbly besought us, that, in our paternal pity we would give them aid in satisfying their devout and beneficial desires; also that we would condescend to meet the supply of their spiritual needs and exhibit our benevolence and that of the Apostolic See in this case. Therefore, moved by the proper and rightful prayers and wishes of the aforesaid natives and dwellers in Greenland, and not having perfect knowledge of the above facts and circumstances, we do, by apostolic letters, command one or both of you, whom we understand to be neighboring bishops, after having carefully investigated and comprehended the statements made above, to learn if it be true. If the is the state of things and if you find the population increased in number and resources to render the fulfillment of their desires expedient, it is our will that you ordain suitable priests of holy life and furnish rectors for the administration of the parishes that have been restored and churches for the administration of the sacraments. In addition, if to one or both of you it may seem timely and expedient, having sought the advice of the metropolitan, if the distance allows, we empower you to appoint and order as bishop for them some profitable and qualified person in communion with us and the Apostolic See, to consecrate, with the customary form of the church, in our name, and give to him the administration of spiritual and temporal things, first receiving from him the proper and usual oath of allegiance to us and the Apostolic See. Having made this a matter of conscience, we by our apostolic authority, give to one or both of you full and unrestricted jurisdiction in this case, according to the tenor of these presents all statutes and constitutions, whether apostolic or of general councils, or of any other kind whatsoever, notwithstanding.

Done at Rome, at St. Potenciana's, in the year 1448, twelfth day before the Kalends of October, the second year of our pontificate."

10

Alexander VI on the See of Gardar

(1492?)

(*The Appointment of Bishop Mathias, O.S.B.*)

Cum, ut accepimus, ecclesia Gardensis in fine mundi sita in terra Gronlandie, in qua homines commorantes ob defectum panis, vini et olei siccis piscibus et lacte uti consueverunt, et ob id ac propter rarissimas navigationes ad dictam terram causantibus intentissimis aquarum congelationibus fieri solitas navis aliqua ab ottuaginta annis non creditur applicuisse, et, si navigationes huiusmodi fieri contingeret, profecto has non nisi mense augusti congelationibus ipsis resolutis fieri posse non existimentur; et propterea eidem ecclesie similiter ab ottuaginta annis vel circa nullus penitus episcoporum vel presbyterorum apud illam personaliter residendo prefuisse dicitur; unde ac propter presbyterorum catholicorum absentiam evenit, quam plures diocesanos olim catholicos sacrum per eos baptisma susceptum proh dolor regnasse [*l. renegasse*], et quod incole eiusdem terre in memoriam christiane religionis non habent nisi quoddam corporale, quod semel in anno presentetur, super quo ante centum annos ab ultimo sacerdote tunc ibidem existente corpus Christi fuit consecratum; hiis igitur et aliis consideratis considerandis, felicis recordationis Innocentius papa VIII, predecessor noster, volens dicte ecclesie tunc pastoris solatio destitute de utili, de ydoneo pastore providere, de fratrum suorum consilio, de quorum numero tunc eramus, venerabilem

fratrem nostrum Mathiam, electum Gardensem, ordinis sancti Benedicti de observantia professum, ad nostram instantiam, dum adhuc in minoribus constituti eramus, proclamatum ad dictam ecclesiam summopere ac magno devotionis fervore accensum pro deviatorum et renegatorum mentibus ad viam salutis eterne reducendis et erroribus huiusmodi eradicandis vitam suam periculo permaximo sponte et libere submictendo navigio etiam personaliter proficisci intendentem, eidem episcopum prefecit et pastorem. Nos igitur eiusdem electi pium et laudabile propositum in Domino quam plurimum commendantes sibique in premissis aliquo subventionis auxilio propter eius paupertatem, qua, ut similiter accepimus, gravatus existit, succurrere cupientes, motu proprio et etiam ex certa nostra scientia de fratrum nostrorum consilio et assensu, dilectis filiis rescribendario, abbreviatoribus necnon sollicitatoribus ac plumbatoribus illarumque registratoribus ceterisque tam cancellarie quam camere nostre apostolice officialibus quibuscumque sub excommunicationis late sententie pena ipso facto incurrenda commictimus et mandamus, ut omnes et singulas litteras apostolicas de et super promotione dicte ecclesie Gardensis pro dicto electo expediendas in omnibus et singulis eorum officiis gratis ubique pro Deo absque cuiuscunque taxe solutione seu exactione expediant et expediri faciant omni contradictione cessante; necnon camere apostolice clericis et notariis, ut litteras, seu bullas huiusmodi dicto electo absque solutione seu exactione alicuius annate seu minutorum servitiorum et aliorum iurium quorumcumque in similibus solvi solutorum [*l. solitorum*] libere tradant et consignent, motu et scientia similibus ac sub penis predictis commictimus et mandamus, in contrarium facientes non obstantibus quibuscumque. Fiat gratis ubique quia pauperrimus.[22]

(*Translation*[23])

A letter of Pope Alexander VI, 1492–1493, by which he appointed Matthias, a monk of St. Benedict, to the Bishopric of Garder, Greenland. The entire volume, 492 pages, is of paper, and the documents seem to have been written carelessly by a rapid hand, except a few by a firm and careful hand in an older style. We have placed Matthias with the titular bishops, yet such was not the intention. Matthias was fully resolved upon the mission.

"We learn that the church of Goder [Garder] situated on the outer boundaries of the world, in the country of Greenland, whose inhabitants are accustomed to live upon dried fish and milk, for the reason that bread, wine and oil are scarce, and for the reason that voyages are rarely made to that region, on account of the freezing of the sea no ship is supposed to have touched there during the past eighty years. We are also informed, that voyages of this kind are not thought possible except in the month of August, after the ice melts, and that no resident bishop or priest has ruled the Church for some eighty years past. Therefore, on account of the lack of priests, it has come to pass that very many of the people of that diocese, who were formerly Catholics, have, alas! denied the sacred baptism they had received. It is said that the people of that land have no other relic of the Christian religion than a corporal that they exhibit once a year, upon which the body of Christ was consecrated by the last priest who was resident one hundred years ago. On account of these and other reasons, our predecessor, Pope Innocent VIII, of happy memory, desiring

[22] Cf. Jelic, *L'évangélisation de l'Amérique avant Christophe Colomb* in the *Compte-rendu du Congrès Scientifique Internationale des Catholiques*, tom. V, 183. Paris, 1891.

[23] Da Costa, *op. cit.*, pp. 216-17.

to furnish an able and meritorious pastor for the said church, so long deprived of that consolation, agreeable to the advice of his brethren, of whom we were one, nominated to the said see, our venerable Brother Matthias, a professed member of the Order of St. Benedict and now bishop-elect of Gader [Gardar] having been preconised on our motion, before an election.

In his intense zeal for those who had fallen away for the recovery of those who have lapsed, and for the suppression of error, he has now resolved to set out upon this most dangerous undertaking. While greatly commending, in the Lord, his holy and meritorious design, we wish to aid him in some means on account of his poverty. Therefore, on our own doing, cognisance and by the advice and consent of our brethren, we direct, under penalty of excommunication, to follow *ipso facto*, our beloved sons, the copyists, abriviators, solicitors, with the holders of seals, and the registerator, and all other officials in the various offices, both of the chancery and apostolic chamber, to forward and to have forwarded promptly and entirely free of charge, all apostolic letters concerning the advancement to the aforesaid church of Gader [Gardar] which need to be sent to the said bishop elect. Moreover, by the same, with similar cognisance and similar penalties, to be visited upon those who incur, who fail to obey, and everything to the contrary notwithstanding, we command the clerics and notaries of the apostolic chamber to give to the said bishop all such briefs and bulls without payment or requirement of any tax or any fees or gratuities ordinarily paid on similar accounting. Let all be done free in all the departments, because he is very poor."

These Documents constitute a valuable group of original sources for the story of the Norse suffragan See of Gardar. Their contents show that the Roman authorities had an intimate knowledge of the Church in Greenland; and an examination of the Archives of Rome and of Drontheim may prove the existence of many more manuscripts on this subject.

BOOK REVIEWS

Character Sketches of the Right Rev. C. P. Maes, D.D. Late Bishop of Covington, Ky. By the Sisters of Divine Providence. Baltimore: John Murphy Co., 1917. Pp. 187.

Camillus P. Maes was born in Courtrai, Belgium, March 13, 1846. Left an orphan at the age of eleven, he became part of the household of a devoted uncle, a priest, who enabled him to finish his classical studies in Courtrai, and then to enter the preparatory Seminary at Roulers. Later he entered the Seminary at Bruges and then went to the American College, Louvain, in order to complete his studies and to prepare himself for the American Missions. He was ordained to the Priesthood at Mechlin, December 19, 1868, and in May, 1869, he set out for America to become a laborer in the Vineyard of Detroit. From 1869 to 1871, he was assistant priest at Mt. Clemens; in April, 1871, he became Pastor of St. Mary's Church, Monroe, Mich., and the following year became Pastor of a new church which he had organized meanwhile, that of St. Joseph's in Monroe. His activity in parish work was not so engrossing as to preclude study, and the fruit of these years at Monroe (1871–1880) was the *Life of the Rev. Charles Nerinckx*, which has been pronounced "one of the most important historical contributions on the history of Kentucky." On March 13, 1880, Bishop Borgess of Detroit appointed Father Maes secretary and chancellor of the Diocese. Two years later (1882), his name was sent to the Holy See as one of the candidates for the See of Grand Rapids. In September, 1884, Father Maes was appointed to the Diocese of Covington, Ky. Bishop Maes, we are told, always liked to recall that at this same Consistory the new Bishop of Mantua was also proclaimed, he who in later years won the love of Christendom under the title of Pius X. As Bishop-elect, Bishop Maes attended the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, in November, 1884, and distinguished himself as an ardent supporter of the proposed measure for the founding of a Catholic University of America. "As a son of great Louvain, he was eminently able to gauge the importance of such an institution and to forsee its influence on both clergy and laity. Identified always with

the cause of higher education and interested in the Catholic University movement from its very inception, Bishop Maes ranks as one of the chief promoters of that noble foundation." The Bishop was a striking figure in any gathering of ecclesiastics. With his tall, spare figure, with a natural dignity of carriage which marked him out from the crowd, Bishop Maes made an impression which would never be forgotten. His intellectual powers were of the highest, and his kindliness of heart and general personal charm aroused enthusiastic admiration and affection not only in Kentucky, where he was loved, but throughout the United States. His long episcopate (1884–1915) saw a wonderful growth on the part of the Church in Kentucky, due in great part to his own powers of administration and guidance. The present Cathedral of St. Mary, in Covington, Ky., which he built, is considered, and rightly so, as one of the finest examples of Gothic architecture in the world.

Like all truly great men, both within and without the Church, Camillus Maes was not understood by all. There were characteristics in his nature in which some saw a strength of will which grew impatient with any leisurely appreciation of his motives; but all recognized that it was the man of God who was acting and that it was the glory of the Master which actuated him in all he did. Knowing his disposition as we do, it can easily be admitted that the wondrous patience, the unalterable sweetness and serenity which distinguished him, were the result of a love for his fellowmen which he possessed to a remarkable degree. And this is the particular value of these *Character Sketches*. They are written with a desire to make Bishop Maes known better and loved better. They give us insights into his life and character which might be lost in the mass of details a biography would necessarily contain. His love for the Blessed Sacrament, his activity in the Eucharistic Congresses of the United States, his solicitude for the rising generation of priests, his ideas on education and family life and his own profound religious spirit are all here described with an intimate touch which makes the work a source of first value to the historian and the churchman. "Bishop Maes lived close to God; his thoughts were never far from God and heaven; simply, naturally, he spoke of God as our Father, and of heaven as our Home." His

passing removed a great figure from the ecclesiastical life of the United States, and his true place in the history of the Church here will loom up more widely as the years pass and the results of his many labors produce their fruit.

The Sisters of Divine Providence of Newport, Ky., deserve commendation for the devotion to his memory in preserving these *Character Sketches* to the future.

Booker T. Washington: Builder of a Civilization. By Scott-Stowe. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1916. Pp. xx + 331.

The best review this welcome addition to American biography will ever receive is already written in the Preface which Theodore Roosevelt has contributed to this volume. "It is hyperbole" he writes, "to say that Booker T. Washington was a great American. For twenty years before his death he had been the most useful, as well as the most distinguished, member of his race in the world, and one of the most useful, as well as one of the most distinguished of American citizens of any race." The volume is not a biography in the ordinary sense. A complete *Life* still remains to be written. What the authors of this book have attempted to do is to present and interpret the leading aspects of the life of a great American who rose from slavery up to one of the highest positions of social and international prominence in the land. The early life of Booker T. Washington has been told for all time in his epoch-making book *Up from Slavery*, and the present volume takes up the story where the other leaves off, and seeks to tell the story of his success during the last fifteen years of his life. It contains a "record of his struggles and achievements at once accurate and readable put into permanent form for the information of the public." The opening chapter tells us of the man and his school in the making. Those early days at Tuskegee read like the beginnings of a religious community in the middle ages. Few founders ever experienced such drawbacks; few have shown more heroic, manly courage. Trouble rained in upon the little community, and not the least of them came from his own people, especially from the negro preachers who were always trying to dispute with Mr. Washington and quarrel with him; "but he just kept his mouth shut," one of

his pupils has written, "and went ahead. He kept pleasant and wouldn't dispute with them, nor argue with them, nor quarrel with them. When the white folks would come around and tell him he was 'spoiling good niggers by education,' he would just ask them to wait patiently and give him time to show them what the right kind of education could do."

In 1895, fourteen years after the founding of Tuskegee Institute, Mr. Washington began to spread the good news of his success in various parts of the South and North, and wherever he appeared, in spite of all prejudice, he won his way quickly and permanently to the hearts of his audience. His greatest speech was probably that at Atlanta, in 1895, and from this time until his death, his words were listened to by social students and educators through the country. His was a fiery logic. Facts, statistics, comparisons, analyses, syntheses, followed one another in quick succession in his talk. "He marshalled them in such a way that they were dynamic and stirring instead of static and paralyzing." Few Americans of our day have achieved a more lasting success than Booker T. Washington, and there are pages in this biographical sketch which every American boy, white and colored, should read. President Eliot of Harvard, in 1896, when conferring upon Mr. Washington the degree of Master of Arts, summed up his life in this characteristically terse way—"teacher, wise helper of his race, good servant of God and country." There is a lesson of service to all the men and women of the race to which Booker T. Washington belonged, which this book will teach them better than anything ever written about their great leader. "He was never led away," say Mr. Roosevelt, "as the educated negro so often is led away, into the pursuit of fantastic visions; into the drawing up of plans fit only for the world of two dimensions. He kept his high ideals, always; but he never forgot for a moment that he was living in an actual world of three dimensions, in a world of unpleasant facts, where those unpleasant facts have to be faced, and he made the best possible out of a bad situation from which there was no ideal best to be obtained. And he walked humbly with his God." The volume deserves to be read widely. A second edition would be much enhanced by the addition of an Index.

Patriots in the Making. What America Can Learn from France and Germany. By Jonathan French Scott, Ph.D. With an Introduction by the Hon. Myron T. Herrick, former Ambassador to France. New York: D. Appleton & Co, 1916. Pp. xvi+246.

The world-war has changed many things and will change many more. Is it to have its effect on our system of education in the United States? Professor Scott sets forth in this book the relationship that has long existed in France and Germany between the school and the national consciousness. The author himself is keenly aware of the moral lesson conveyed by his pages and of the dangers which may be looked for if the United States enters on a course of characteristic propaganda in its schools. The experiment as here described, of training the mind of youth to look on other nations as hereditary foes may be said to have had its fruition in the present world-war. The principles on which such an experiment are based are rooted, necessarily, in an exaggerated sense of nationalism and will, if carried to extremes, nullify the success of any international organization to promote the interests of all nations alike and to accentuate the claims of humanity. Whether such an experiment will ever be undertaken in the United States seems doubtful. Any prediction on the subject, however, must, of necessity, be conditioned on the state of the world when the war shall have come to an end. The historical portion of the work, that dealing with the nationalistic and patriotic purposes which found expression in the school curricula, will have a deep interest for students of education and for political philosophers. In a few well-arranged chapters the author points out the changing methods in education which have been pursued in France and in a certain degree has shed new light on the recent strife in France between Church and State. "The world has just begun to realize how well the Third Republic has carried its burdens, how zealously it has set itself to the fulfilment of its ideals. The educational system of the country did not at first respond to these new forces which were beginning to dominate the life of the nation. For more than a decade the school remained almost entirely in the hands of the Church, inculcating in the rising generation those beliefs and ideals for which the Church stood. In the

early eighties, however, the government usurped (or shall we say 'resumed') control over education, and in later years completed the work of making instruction almost a state monopoly."

The theory of government which lies behind the system of education which makes of every child a potential warrior is no less worthy of study than the methods followed in the French schools. As seen by Professor Scott the work of inculcating patriotism revolved around these points: (1) the love of France; (2) the military spirit and obligatory service; (3) the duty of inculcating physical courage. Furthermore, (4) the children have learned to know that taxation is necessary to support the army; (5) they have been given some definite information in regard to the state of the national defenses; and (6) certain writers have pointed out to them the perils of depopulation in a country menaced by increasingly powerful neighbors.

Similar aims in educational processes are found by Professor Scott to have dominated the entire educational system of Germany. "Germany," he says, "beyond all other modern states, has embodied national aspirations in its educational system, which, though not wholly free from the influences of tradition custom and conservatism, recognizes in a degree elsewhere unparalleled the value of education as a political instrument and a factor in national evolution."

The work ends with two chapters on "The Lesson for America" and "Military Training in Europe." The latter contains much impartial information that cannot fail, if read, to enlighten many of our leaders and legislators. The author submits American ideals in education to a searching test in his chapter on the "Lesson for America." It may be within the bounds of possibility that American education will become national in tone and character as a result of the war and that it may be regulated and directed by Congress and by a Federal Minister of Education.

State Administration in Maryland, Johns Hopkins University, Studies in Historical and Political Sceinces. By John L. Donaldson, Ph.D. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1916. Series XXXIV, No. 4. Pp. 155.

This monograph, as we learn from the author's Preface, although a study of Administration in Maryland, is in no sense a

history. The historical development of certain factors of administration has not been neglected, but the work deals exclusively with the organization and the interrelations of the administrative departments of the Maryland government, and attempts a scientific analysis of their functions and forms. Without endeavoring to describe the entire governmental structure of the State of Maryland, the author has limited his field to "that part of the Executive branch which has to do with the actual performance of duties relating directly to the economic, intellectual, and moral welfare of the people." The volume is, therefore, divided into five chapters, dealing with Public Education, Public Health, Charities and Corrections, Finance, and General Economic Welfare. The Catholic reader will find a very fair and impartial estimate of these public functions. Catholic schools and colleges and Catholic charities do not fall within the scope of the author's researches. Recent attacks upon organized Charities give an especial interest to the chapter on *Charities and Corrections*. There is no uniform or centralized system of charities in the State of Maryland. Benevolent institutions are helped in a haphazard and irregular way, through the Board of State Aid and Charities, which was instituted in 1850. It consists of seven members, appointed by the Governor, and they give their services free. The Board has the power of investigating the condition and management of all public or other charitable institutions receiving state aid. The author is very frank in his criticism of the deficiencies of public charities. There are paragraphs on the treatment of criminals which will astonish the reader. Over the whole administrative system lies the blight of disintegration. "We may," he says, "summarize Maryland Administration needs as follows: gubernatorial supervision; intra-departmental as well as inter-departmental centralization; integration; and standardization of services."

The Japanese Conquest of American Opinion. By Montaville Flowers, M.A. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1917. Pp. xvii+272.

International intrigue is always fascinating. When it reaches the level of attempting to control Public Opinion in a neighboring state, it may be a menace. The author of this book frankly

aims at exposing what he regards as a thoroughly organized effort on the part of the Japanese and certain pro-Nippon Americans to control and direct American Public Opinion in favor of Japan.

The work while polemical in tone, takes up many phases of the question of the relations of Japan and the United States from a religious and ethnological standpoint. In the first part of his study, Mr. Flowers discusses the Japanese Problem as found in California and the Western States and shows how the problem is one national, not local, in character. If this question, which haunts every American statesman and which can become a source of international conflict at any moment, is ever to be settled it will only be by a thorough airing of its merits in those parts of the United States which are not immediately affected by Japanese immigration. The basis of this crux in American diplomacy is expounded in the two remaining sections of the book dealing with the "Forces and Methods of the Japanese Conquest" and "Bases of Opinions, Old and New." In those two sections, the author does not hesitate to give names and to direct his charges against various individuals and organizations who are engaged in lulling the fears of Americans regarding their neighbors across the Pacific.

Holiness of the Church in the Nineteenth Century. Rev. Constantine Kempf, S.J. Translated from the German by Rev. Francis Breymann, S.J. New York: Benzinger Brothers, 1916. Pp. 415.

That the nineteenth century possessed so many holy martyrs and confessors, as contained in this book, seems at first sight incredible. We are often told that we are living in materialistic times, when the search is more for honor and wealth than for a high place in the realm of sanctity; but there are two hundred persons listed in this work with an account of their life and death, and it forms, indeed, a grand review of heroes. All classes and conditions of men and women, ecclesiastic and lay, are here represented, and the value of the work, apart from its many surprises, is that the student of nineteenth century Catholicism possesses in this volume a martyrology, containing important facts for the history of the Church for which he would

look in vain elsewhere. The volume is divided into six parts: Holy Bishops, Holy Secular Priests, Holy Religious Men and Women, Holy Laymen and Women, and Martyrs. In an Appendix the list is given chronologically, and a working bibliography is added for the guidance of those interested in the life of any particular person mentioned in the list. Among the names of those who labored in the United States are: Archbishop Alemany, Bishop Neumann, C.SS.R., Cardinal Cheverus, Bishop Dubourg, Archbishop Carroll, Mother Seton, and others. The work is well translated, and it deserves to be made known to all our religious communities. It is one of the most interesting volumes on Catholic history of the past year.

The Life of Clara Barton. By Percy H. Epler. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1916. Pp. 432.

In the year 1821, when Clara Barton was born, the strife of American political parties had sunk to rest, but the agitation of the sections had only just begun. Later, when discussions on the extension of slavery culminated in civil war, she had attained to maturity of years and as a volunteer nurse acted a noble part in lessening the amount of human suffering. She was not long in learning the needs of the sick and the wounded and hourly she grew more efficient in providing for them. Even before she was known to the soldier as "the angel of the battlefield" the trained eyes of army surgeons had perceived her courage, her resourcefulness, and her skill. But in point of fact it was not courage, for she tells us that fear had oppressed all her younger days. She was urged to the perilous edge of battle solely by her love of humanity. This ardor it was that sustained her in tattered tent and flooded field, under the guns of Charleston or in the almost tropical storms of Virginia. Love of mankind made her indifferent alike to summer rains or wintry blasts.

Quite apart from the intrinsic interest of this book, which is not inconsiderable, a knowledge of its contents would be of the greatest value to every officer who commands a company or a regiment as well as to every member of the military committees of Congress.

The observation and experience of Miss Barton prove to a demonstration the utter inadequacy throughout the Civil War of the resources of the surgeons at the front. More than a generation later, in the short war with Spain, matters had not greatly mended. At any rate, her services were not then deemed superfluous.

If the recorded experience of her long life teaches any lesson, it is that an army is still incomplete when its munitions are abundant, its officers trained, its soldiers drilled, and its commissary service efficient. In addition there must be prompt attention to the sick and the wounded, of whom many are too feeble to apply for food or for medical treatment.

If the class of citizens which shoulders the rifle and fills the ranks of marching regiments were in control of Congress, it might make unnumbered blunders, but there would be adequate provision for those disabled in line of duty.

With us it appears to be somewhat as it is with those Old World monarchs who hold that human flesh is cheap. Or perhaps it is rather that it is easy for one to bear the wounds or the infirmities of one's neighbor. If our own experience has never spoken clearly on this subject, that of Europe will suffice for instruction.

Not, of course, amongst the friends of Miss Barton, but in the popular American mind the notion seems to prevail that she conceived the idea of founding the Red Cross Association. Whereas, according to her own account the honor belongs to M. Henry Dunant, a Swiss gentleman who had witnessed human suffering after the great battle of Solferino in the summer of 1859. He afterward wrote the *Souvenir de Solferino*, which, translated into many languages, created a sensation. In it he urged the organization in every country of societies to care for the wounded. In 1864 came the International Congress of Geneva, attended by delegates from sixteen governments. A few years later, after the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war, Miss Barton was invited by the officers of the International Red Cross of Europe to assist them in their work. In short, long before she arrived in Europe the Red Cross had been established.

On her return to America, though in feeble health, she never

ceased to cherish her principal object, namely, to found a branch of the Red Cross Association in the United States and so to broaden its scope that it would care not only for the victims of war but for every sort of distress which is likely to afflict a nation. When official support came slowly, she was not discouraged. She must have known that for the most part the official mind is fashioned by the pressure of tradition. The world outside had overtaken her, and she was certain that her native land would soon take its place with the progressive states of Europe. It was in 1882 that she saw her endeavors crowned with success. A slight acquaintance with events since that date shows the praiseworthy activity of the association which she introduced into America and improved for humanity.

Christopher Columbus. By Mildred Stapley. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1916. Pp. 240.

This attractive little volume is one of a series whose avowed purpose it is to "tell the life stories of Americans who have achieved greatness in different fields of endeavor." The authors of this series are such only as "have shown that they have an appreciation of what makes really good juvenile literature." The story of Christopher Columbus, the greatest American by adoption, certainly was written with such an appreciation; it is presented in a style that must prove attractive not only to the younger but also to the older readers. It breathes the spirit of truth and presents in their proper light the various legends that had been included in every life of Columbus until the more scientific criticism of the last decades showed them to be without a foundation. The story of the Discoverer is told vividly and with a sympathy that we would fain have had the Great Admiral himself experience.

The first chapter introduces the reader to Granada on the day of its conquest by Ferdinand and Isabella, the day of the promised royal audience for which Columbus had waited almost seven years. With the interest thus aroused, the necessary facts of his youth, his life as a sailor, his love for the sea, rumors about "lands in the west," the growing project in his mind, the encouragement received, and the many, many disappointments before

succeeding are pictured in such a way that each page adds to the interest and sympathy aroused in the reader. The great day finally arrives on which Columbus starts in quest of these "lands in the west," not of a new route to India as the popular legends would have us believe. But the goal has not yet been reached. Days, weeks, nay months of hope and despair must still be endured by the fleet of three ships, the largest of which is only twenty-five feet in width. Daily the signs of hope are noticed only to be followed by a keener disappointment, until at last land sighted dispels all rebellious thoughts and gloomy faces. After the Admiral's own ship had been wrecked through the faithlessness of his men, the return voyage was commenced and accomplished with extreme hardships. Now the Discoverer of a New World enjoyed his only real triumph. His subsequent life is told in a manner that excites still more the compassion of the reader. Columbus made a second and a third trip, remarkable mainly for the disappointments and hardships suffered, and for his return from the discovered territories, where he had been deposed and stripped of all power, in cruel chains. Popular feeling removed these chains, but further it would not go. The royal pair, indeed, remunerated him munificently but could not keep the promises he had exorbitantly demanded and had received before sailing for the first time. He made a fourth trip with a broken heart, received further cruel treatment on the part of the Spanish colonists, met hardships innumerable, and returned a weak old man to spend his last days unknown and uncared for. His death, May 20, 1506, "passed unheeded" by all Spain, and thus ended the life "whose results were more stupendous than those of any other human life ever lived."

Throughout this story, which is true history with all the interest of a lively narrative, the purpose of the volume is kept well in mind, and facts are mentioned in a way that cannot but leave an impression on the youthful mind and convey to it at the same time the wholesome lessons that the lives of all great men teach.

French Policy and the American Alliance of 1778. By Edward S. Corwin, Ph.D. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1916. Pp. 414.

A reviewer of the impressionist school would be at once struck by the prodigious amount of scholarly research displayed in Dr. Corwin's very readable study of the alliance between France and the United States. State papers, diplomatic correspondence, Journals of Parliamntary Debates, and of debates of the Continental Congress, texts of treaties and of constitutions have been searchingly scanned with critical eye for the assembling of the materials used in the unfolding of this intensely dramatic story of what the author calls—and might we not venture even to say, questionably calls?—"the one entangling alliance to which the United States has been party."

Throughout the four hundred pages of the work, the author lays particular stress upon the fact that this alliance between France and the North American Colonies was "motivated primarily by her desire to recover her lost preeminence on the Continent of Europe." While it is generally true that most writers of American History have been willing to concede that were it not for the aid which France gave to the struggling American colonies in the Revolutionary War, this conflict would probably have ended without the Colonies achieving their independence; nevertheless. American writers have been all too prone to regard this alliance as an outcome of the struggle between France and England for preeminence in the Western Hemisphere. This is but half truth. Dr. Corwin's exhaustive studies of Doniol's monumental work, *Histoire de la Participation de la France à l'Etablissement des Etats-Unis d'Amérique, Correspondance Diplomatique et Documents*, lead him to shift the emphasis to where it more rightly belongs. This is that the alliance was not the result of the fact that France and England were striving for colonial domination in the western hemisphere alone, but that this struggle was but an incident in the more deeply laid conflict for supremacy in Europe. Naturally enough, the Count de Vergennes plays an important role in this diplomatic drama. The character of the man, his hopes and aims, his methods, his successes and failures are all developed in the book with such narrative skill that the purely academic and scholarly motif is

occasionally carefully concealed in a style that is happily refreshing. The chapter on the Mississippi and the Western Land Question is particularly illuminating and interesting. The claim of the United States to extend to the Mississippi is studied in great detail, and, in fact, the entire chapter seems to stand out as a complete essay in itself. The work as a whole is replete with interest and rich in learning.

History of the United States. By Emerson David Fite, Ph.D., Frederick Ferris Thompson, Professor of Political Science in Vassar College. With Maps and Illustrations. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1916. Pp. xii+55.

The tendency to make of text-books, especially those intended for use in secondary schools and colleges, a thesis expounding some pet theory of the author is by no means uncommon at the present time. One striking merit in the work of Professor Fite is in having avoided this pitfall. In addition, the work is more than usually well divided, and though written with a view to introduce the student to present day conditions, the earlier periods in the history of the country have not been slighted. The author does, however, call attention to the fact that less space than usual has been given to military history. The reason for this departure is not stated. The bibliography appended to work is by no means exhaustive and suffers from the unaccountable omission of "date and place of publication' of the books which are enumerated.

NOTES AND COMMENT

With the opening of the academic year 1917-1918, the entire educational system of the country from primary-school work up to graduate research in the universities will find itself face-to-face with a problem unique in its demand upon both teacher and pupil and unavoidable particularly in the domain of history. The relationship between the scholar and the master will undergo a vital change during the Long Vacation, and professors of history will meet with a light of inquiry in the eyes of the students which will be asking for one thing and asking with an insistence which time-worn methods of pedagogy cannot silence. The Great World War, into which our beloved land has entered and out of which America can never come, except as a victorious leader of the democracies of the world, is still in the state of vagueness for most of our people.

The pronouncements of President Wilson must needs be brought to the minds of the children in our schools, to the students of our colleges and universities and to the people at large. The multiplex cause of the War, the problems—economic, social and religious—it has created, the work of preparation on the part of a people gigantic in size but unconscious of its strength, the question of National Patriotism, and many equally important aspects of the crisis to which America has awakened, will be part of the history-teacher's work for many years to come. Direction, guidance, help, orientation, method, and organized effort are all necessary, if this is to be carried out on a patriotic scale. The present time is America's golden opportunity to bury with the dead past all traces of racial, social and religious differences which have been a blight on America's progress since the days of the First Constitutional Congress. If America is to be the land where hate expires, if the Lines of Demarcation which have kept this country a heterogeneous collection of Little Europes are to be obliterated, and if we are to arise a mighty and powerful land with one voice and one heart, it will be in a large measure due to the teachers of history. They come more closely to the heart of the nation than professors of any other branch of knowledge, and the responsibility which rests on them is a grave one.

Where responsibility looms up, the individual consciousness sometimes slackens. Many await the initiative in others. All look for a leader, but in general the "muddling-through" process which has now become famous in England, holds a supreme place at the deliberation board. Fortunately for the United States, and more fortunately still for history men and women in the land, the Declaration of War found its prompt response in the patriotic hearts of some twenty historians, who met at Washington during the last days of April, 1917, and established a *National Board for Historical Service*.

The Resolutions adopted were as follows:

As an emergency measure, to serve until action by the American Historical Association, the undersigned, meeting in Washington upon invitation by the Carnegie Institution of Washington through its Department of Historical Research, have adopted the following resolutions:

Resolved:

I. That there be formed a National Board for Historical Service.

II. That the headquarters of the Board shall be in Washington, D. C.

III. That the purposes of the National Board for Historical Service shall be:

(*a*) To facilitate the coordination and development of historical activities in the United States in such a way as to aid the Federal and the State governments through direct personal service or through affiliation with their various branches.

(*b*) To aid in supplying the public with trustworthy information of historical or similar character through the various agencies of publication, through the preparation of reading-lists and bibliographies, through the collection of historical material, and through the giving of lectures and of systematic instruction, and in other ways.

(*c*) To aid, encourage and organize State, regional and local committees, as well as special committees for the furtherance of the above ends, and to cooperate with other agencies and organizations, especially in the general field of social studies.

IV. That the Board shall be composed of at least nine members who shall select a chairman, vice-chairman, secretary and treasurer from their own number, and that the said Board shall have power to add to its membership, to fill vacancies, to appoint advisory and associated members, to organize affiliated or subsidiary boards of committees, to receive and disburse moneys, and to perform such other acts as may be necessary for the accomplishment of the purposes herein stated.

V. That the Board, until further action by itself in conformity with these resolutions, shall be composed of the following:

Victor S. Clark, of Washington; Robert D. W. Connor, of Raleigh, N. C.; Carl Russell Fish, of Madison, Wis.; Charles D. Hazen, of New York City; Charles H. Hull, of Ithaca, N. Y.; Gaillard Hunt, of Washington; Waldo G. Leland, of Washington; James T. Shotwell, of New York City; Frederick J. Turner, of Cambridge, Mass.

Adopted at Washington, D. C., April 29, 1917.

Henry E. Bourne, Edmund C. Burnett, Victor S. Clark, George M. Dutcher, Guy S. Ford, Charles D. Hazen, Charles H. Hull, Gaillard Hunt, J. Franklin Jameson, H. Barrett Learned, Waldo G. Leland, Albert E. McKinley, Andrew C. McLaughlin, Thomas Walker Page, Frederic L. Paxson, James T. Shotwell, Frederick J. Turner.

The following statement which appears in the current July issue of the *American Historical Review* (Vol. xxii, pp. 831-835) has been courteously given to the editor for simultaneous publication.

Historical Scholars in War-Time

Apart from such services as can be rendered equally well by any other able-bodied or intelligent man, what can the "history man" do for his country in time of war, of things for which he is especially fitted by his professional acquirements and habits of mind? Many historical scholars, with the summer vacation before them, are asking the question, of themselves or of others. Many have not found a satisfying answer. It seems relatively easy for the scientist to provide himself with a task that offers good prospects of direct usefulness. He can invent a new range-finder or a new explosive. He can improve the quality of optical glass. He can seek new sources of potash. He can make two potatoes grow where one grew before. And, what is quite as important, the public and the authorities are abundantly aware of the usefulness of what he is doing, while both are prone to regard the historian as occupied only with the dates and detail of remote transactions having no relation to the fateful exigencies of the present day.

Against such an opinion the mind of the virile historical student protests with all his might. What is more essential to the successful prosecution of a great national war than an enlightened, unified, and powerfully-acting public opinion? Why is France so heroically strong a combatant, and Russia, with the four times the population, so weak? All the munitions that could be piled on the banks of the Dvina or the Sereth could not give military strength to a nation that does not know its own mind, to a population in which, outside a small percentage, public opinion has no existence. The American gun may be the best that science can make it, the man behind it unsurpassed in quality, but how long will he persist in his fearful struggle if the people at home do not see why he should?

But how can public opinion in America be enlightened, homogeneous, and powerful, in a crisis which is in the plainest way the product of historic forces, if it is not informed in the facts and lessons of history? It is notorious how large a part, in giving to German public opinion its marvellous unity and cohesion, has been played by the chauvinistic history lessons of the German school-master. Heaven forbid that we should imitate their chauvinism; the American enters the war distinctly as a citizen of the world. Rather, he enters the war with that intention; but to make him truly such a citizen requires an enormous expansion of his political education, a quick shift of his point of view, rapid reinforcements to his knowledge of European conditions. In the supply of such knowledge, vital alike to intelligent prosecution of the war and to intelligent assistance in the settlement of peace, the historian cannot doubt that his part may rightly be a large one, seeing how largely those European conditions are results of history, inexplicable without its light.

Such a state of the facts calls loudly upon the historical scholar to come out from his cloistered retirement and to use for the information of the public whatever knowledge of European history he may possess—and to use it energetically and boldly. He is conscious of its imperfection; he is accustomed to write slowly, supporting every sentence with a foot-note; he is already, as his daily duty, pressing excellent historical information, by re-

fined methods, upon youthful minds, and hopes thus to ensure that the next generation shall be more historically minded, better fitted for citizenship of the world. But meanwhile the war is to be won or lost, the future peace of the world ensured or jeopardized, by the adult generation now on the scene. Let him come out into the market-place, and make his voice heard by the men of his own age. If they do not receive his message with the docility with which he is accustomed to see it received by his undergraduates, so much the better for him. His training being what it has been, he is much less likely to be found offering worthless wares with bold presumption than to be keeping valuable knowledge to himself, with needless modesty, "And that one talent that is death to hide, Lodged with him useless."

If, for instance, the historical student knows more than most of his fellow-citizens about the history of Servia and its neighbors, or that of Poland or Belgium or Alsace-Lorraine; if his historical studies have brought him that knowledge of Russian character and its possibilities which many would be glad to possess; if his familiarity with recent Austro-Hungarian history enables him, better than others, to estimate the centrifugal and centripetal forces in the Dual Monarchy; if he has studied with some care the history of German economic policy in general, or of the Bagdad Railway in particular, of the Social Democratic party in Germany, of the workings of the imperial constitution, or of the character and results of German rule over non-German populations; if he can show how great alliances against aspiring *Weltmächte*—against Charles V, Louis XIV, Napoleon—have worked in the past, what can be expected of them in the way of unity, what can not; if he knows the history of Pitt's subsidies, or of neutral export of munitions to belligerents; if he can so set forth the condition of Europe after Waterloo as partially to illuminate the dark questions of recovery after universal war; if he can cast historical light on the problems of American Christian missions in the Turkish Empire or of Japanese encroachments in the Pacific—let him by all means, "by printing, writing, or advised speaking," bring his knowledge forward, for the information of a public which eagerly desires to act with intelligence. Many other topics, instructive in war-time, will occur to the historical mind as the changing phases of the war develop.

Still more urgent are the reasons, and much wider the opportunities, for the exercise of the same function in the field of American history. If in the actual warfare of the trenches, under conditions so different from those of previous wars, we must be chiefly guided by the experience of those who for three years have been sustaining the conflict, yet in the thousand and one matters that must be transacted on this side of the ocean, on the soil of the United States and among the masses of its people, no experience can be so helpful to American action as American experience, whenever any that is apposite can be adduced. It is easy to say that times, methods, and the nation itself have changed, that the conditions of our present warfare are unprecedented, that we must look at the facts as they are, not as they once were. Yet in all these problems of legislation and execution that lie before us, some of the elements are permanent; some of the methods used in former wars worked well or ill for reasons still operative. Neither ingenuity nor experience is alone sufficient, for man or nation; he is best guided who makes use of both.

At all events, history *will* be invoked, whatever we do, is being invoked every day, and if the public is not guided by sound historical information, it will be guided by unsound. When the bill for a selective draft was under debate in Congress, several members of that body sought to adduce our experience with conscription in the Civil War, but it was plain, even to Congress, that they did not know what that experience was. If persons of adequate historical knowledge would seasonably inform them and the public as to the actual merits and demerits of the Committee on the Conduct of the War, as to the experience of the United States with political generals, with army contractors during the Civil War, with "conscientious objectors," with newspaper disclosures of military information, with pension frauds, with the income tax, they might be sure that much of the seed sown would fall on good ground.

The final application of the lessons of experience lies mostly in other hands than those of the historian. His function, as historian, may be confined to the presentation of correct historical information, and it is not for an historical journal to offer advice as to how he or others may apply it. Yet the historian is also a citizen, and as such is entitled to speak his mind upon the issues of the hour. It is for him to judge, according to personal and local circumstances, whether he will do most good by speaking or writing solely as an historian, presenting the facts of history without suspicion of *Tendenz*, or by using them in advocacy of policies which he feels impelled and qualified to defend. The main matter is, that he shall not be withheld, by needless modesty or by timidity, from making use, in one helpful way or another, of such knowledge of the past as he may possess. If he has better knowledge than his fellows, or knows better how with brief labor to acquire it, upon the bond and treasury-note operations of the Civil War, upon its varying effects on wages and prices respectively, upon the blockades and other commercial restrictions of Napoleonic times, upon the history of German or Irish or Polish opinion in the United States, or even upon minor topics like the Sanitary Commission or the Christian Commission or the New England Loyal Publication Society, by all means let him speak up. Anything that helps the public to see the present conflict in a wider perspective is an aid toward intelligent national conduct in war-time. If the cloistered student has never had the habit of addressing the general public, it is no matter; it will do him good to try.

As to the means and methods, they are many—books, pamphlets, articles in magazines and newspapers, lectures and addresses. Especially let it be remembered that the great metropolitan magazines and dailies are by no means the only agencies by which American public opinion is formed. The professor may have, or may easily obtain, access to the columns of papers more local in circulation, and through editorial or other articles may take part in the great work of informing local opinion, which everywhere has its peculiar qualities and needs, qualities and needs which he perhaps understands better than they can be understood by writers in some distant metropolis. As for speaking, a little thought will show him that, with our numberless summer schools and teachers' institutes and similar assemblies, there is no lack of opportunities for laying good history before interested audiences.

If the historical scholar finds no chance to do any of these things, at the least he can encourage and advise neighboring librarians and historical

societies in respect to the collecting of materials upon the war, to the end that the future historian may find the means for treating it with all possible breadth of view and in all its varying aspects; for the historical scholar of the present day should surely be better able than others to foresee what kinds of material, economic and social as well as political and military, will be desired by those who come after.

But in respect to all these methods of approach, the historical scholar would do well to communicate first with the National Board for Historical Service, and who are desirous and prepared to be of use in respect to all the lines of activity which have been indicated above. The address of its secretary is Mr. Waldo G. Leland, 1133 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C

J. F. J.

The *Catholic Historical Review* voices its entire sympathy with this noble enterprise. All Catholic scholars can share in the work; and among the various bodies of scholars throughout the country to which appeal can justly be made for cooperation, is the Priesthood of the Catholic Church of America. To assist in the work of collecting, preserving, and making accessible the records and source-material for the history of the country during the War, and to aid more directly in the historical outlook by writing articles, pamphlets, or books on topics connected with the War, are two of the opportunities of which such a scholarly group of men, whose training has given them a surety of judgment and an intense love of country, may easily avail themselves. The Catholic historical magazines, the powerful Catholic press of the country, and the Catholic Reviews will find ample material upon which to work in this great design of making America predominantly American. It may be too soon to organize upon lines similar to those by Catholics in France and England, There is, for example, a British Catholic Information Society, of which Father Martindale, S.J., the biographer of Robert Hugh Benson, is the general editor, which issues *Catholic Monthly Letters*. The topics treated so far are:

1. English Catholics to their Fellow Catholics.
2. Catholicism under the British Flag.
3. The Catholic Church and its Place in the British Empire.
4. Teuton against Roman; From Luther to Haeckel.
5. The Part played by Catholic Women in National Life.
6. England, Ireland and the Catholic Church.
7. British Catholic Writers and Artists.

There are many who think, and perhaps, rightly, that Catholics ought not to act in a separatist way in problems which affect the whole nation and that any accentuation of their religious position, which must always remain rigid in its relation to the principles of non-Catholic religious societies, would only tend to confuse the Catholic attitude of toleration towards the members of these societies. Consequently, some may deem it imprudent for Catholic scholars to organize upon independent lines. Meanwhile, however, all can help the *National Board for Historical Service* by collecting material, and by putting into practice the suggestions Dr. Jameson makes in his letter.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

III. HISTORICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

The purpose of this department, as outlined in the first number of the REVIEW, has been to introduce the student of American Church History to the principles and practices of the science itself. So far, seven papers have been published in these pages, and we have come far enough on our way to afford a moment for retrospection. To gather from the books already published on Method, on Introduction, on Historical Research, and on Historical Bibliography, the elements of a Guide or Manual for the direction of the student, and to place in the hands of the student who has chosen for his special field of research-work the history of the Catholic Church in the United States, a Manual containing an Introduction and a Guide to the source-material of his subject is a task which, although successfully carried out by scholars in other branches of historical activity, is by no means easy of accomplishment. Such a Manual should be confined as far as possible, to the strict needs of the student. Those needs may be summed up in various ways. Collins, following the plan of Langlois-Seignobos, has treated them under two heads in his *Study of Ecclesiastical History:* namely, the Process of Analysis and the Process of Synthesis. The work of Analysis usually consists of two distinct operations: (1) Collection of the Material, "which may be of all kinds: actual vestiges of the past, pictures, engravings, inscriptions, laws, canons, state papers, letters, narratives of eye-witnesses, chronicles, poems, sermons, treatises, and so forth, according to the nature of the subject." (2) Examination of the Documents, which must be taken one by one and carefully appraised. The work of Synthesis is the process of uniting into narrative form the isolated facts found in the analytical process. The student has "to draw together this digested and critically appraised material, to reintegrate it with the help of the insight he has acquired in the process of analyzing it, and to reconstruct out of the chaotic elements before him a narrative of events which shall be absolutely faithfully to this evidence and yet not merely jejune and skeleton-like." There are, naturally, many systems of approaching this problem of method in historical research, but all meet upon the common ground of the conditions governing the scientific procedure of historical work in its three basic operations—research, criticism, and composition. The proposed Manual, which has already been suggested in these pages, may be constructed on the following tentative plan:

I. Research Work.—Search for the Materials (Heuristics).
- I. Introduction to the Historical Method.
- II. The Auxiliary Sciences.
- III. Historical Bibliography.

II. Historical Criticism.—Analysis of the Materials.
- I. External Criticism (Provenance)
  - 1. Testing the Genuineness of the Source.
  - 2. Localizing it in time and place.
  - 3. Analyzing, editing, or restoring it.

II. Internal Criticism (Exegesis).
   1. Determining the Value of the Source.
   2. Interpreting its contents.
   3. Establishing the historicity of its facts.

III. Historical Composition.—Synthetic operations.
   1. General and Special Historical works.
   2. Monographs.
   3. Historical Dissertations.
   4. Publication of Sources, etc., etc.

So far, our papers have covered in a brief and concise way the questions of Historical Introduction and the Auxiliary Sciences. This present paper on Historical Bibliography completes the first group of subjects which must be treated under the general heading of Heuristics, or the search for the Source-Material.

A tentative definition of Historical Bibliography would embrace three elements: the different classes of source-material, the different instruments of research, and the practical organization of research-work. The science of Historical Bibliography has for its object to indicate the method to be followed, and the helps to be used, in research-work. The different classes of research-material may be roughly divided into Sources and Historical Works. Sources may be either narrative, documentary, literary, or archeological. Historical Works may be either general or special; that is, without any given limits, or, restricted to the limits of time, place, and idea. The instruments of bibliographical research may be Gudies, Manuals, Repertories, Dictionaries, Encyclopedias, or Bibliographies, all of which are destined to enable the student to learn quickly and accurately what source-material exists upon any given subject, and to suggest to his imagination other possible *dépôts* for such material. To take a practical example: let us suppose that a student has chosen for his subject, *The Rise of the Catholic Hierarchy in the United States* (1763–1808). His first duty is to understand clearly the limits of time, place and idea contained in that title. He must understand why the years 1763–1808 are selected. He must visualize graphically either in his mind or upon a map which he has drawn up specially for that purpose, the extent of the "United States" during those years. He must have a very definite idea of what he means by the term—*Rise of the Catholic Hierarchy*. Following the simplest division of bibliographical helps—Repertories, Didactic Books, and Periodicals, a search through the articles cognate to his subject in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, for example, would give him a more or less clear idea of the subject and would introduce him to the historical works on the subject. These he would quickly learn are either general or special. A general work would be SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, Vol. ii (*Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll*), New York, 1888; a special work would be RUSSELL, *Maryland, the Land of Sanctuary* (Baltimore, 1907). Both these works would lead him into the realm of source-material, and by diligent search, he would soon draw up a bibliographical list of all the printed and unprinted material for his subject. For printed material the student would find as indispensable, the Roman Documents on the question published

by Professor Haskins in the *American Historical Review*, Vol. xv (1910), pp. 800–29—*Documents relative to the adjustment of the Roman Catholic organization in the United States*. A further search would reveal the translation of these documents by Father Devitt, S.J., in the *Records* of the American Catholic Historical Society, Vol. xxi (1910), pp. 185–236. Step by step, the student would clear a pathway for himself through all the printed material on his subject, and would bring his researches up to date by ransacking all the historical periodicals in order to make sure that he had missed nothing for his subject. There would remain still the real field of his research work—the unprinted material. With the aid, for example, of the Carnegie *Guides* he would be quickly put in possession with the location of this material, and personal search in such collections as the Baltimore Archdiocesan Archives, the Westminster (London) Archdiocesan Archives, and other local collections, such as those at Georgetown University, and the Catholic Archives of America (Notre Dame University), would round out his researches. With photograph-copies from Rome, Paris, Simancas, and Seville, of all documents bearing on his subject, the next problem would be the practical method of putting all this material into shape for the work of Historical Criticism, and later, of Historical Composition. These two operations will be treated briefly in subsequent papers. We confine ourselves now to some general directions for Historical Bibliography, again restricting it to the field of American Church History.

The bibliographical helps for Ecclesiastical History in general, or what are called the *Instruments de travail*, are entirely too numerous to be mentioned in detail. It will suffice to say to the student who has a definite object in view in his research-work that with a little systematic effort, he can sieve the whole realm of source and book material in such a way as to be practically certain that nothing has escaped his notice. The Instruments of Bibliographical Research ready for his use are usually divided as follows:

I. General Bibliographies (for all the sciences).
1. Universal bibliographies.
2. Historical bibliographies.
3. Chronological bibliographies.

II. Special Bibliographies (for a particular science. We restrict our division to Bibliographies for the Historical Sciences).
1. Bibliographies of the historical method.
2. Bibliographies of the auxiliary sciences.
3. Bibliographies of the philosophy of history.
4. Bibliographies of the universal history.
5. Bibliographies of the particular history.
   - A. Bibliography of general history.
   - B. Bibliography of special history (Institutions).
     - (*a*) Constitutional or political history.
     - (*b*) Law.
     - (*c*) Economic problems.
     - (*d*) Literature.
     - (*e*) Art.
     - (*f*) Sociology.
     - (*g*) Religion.

Under this last division of Religious History, which, in general, is the history of the different creeds of humanity, we have in a restricted sense Ecclesiastical History, or the History of the Christian Church. The only noteworthy attempt to cover the whole field of Ecclesiastical History from the bibliographical viewpoint is the work of CHARLES DE SMEDT, S.J., *Introductio Generalis ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam* (Ghent, 1876). The modern text-books, especially those of Hergenröther and Funk, contain bibliographical references in abundance; but no complete Bibliography of Ecclesiastical History, containing a systematic guidance for the student, has ever been published. The reason is obvious. One has only to make use of CHEVALIER, *Répertoire des sources historiques du Moyen Age* (Paris, 4 vols., 1879–99), to realize that it is folly for any one scholar to attempt such a work. Each student of ecclesiastical history is, practically speaking, obliged to make his own set of cards. Beginning with a Universal Bibliography, such as STEIN, *Manuel de Bibliographie Général* (Paris, 1897), the student quickly sees that the first, and one might say, the indispensable, volume for his desk is LANGLOIS, *Manuel de Bibliographie Historique* (Paris, 1904). With the aid of Langlois, he learns the best book to be consulted for General Bibliography (Catalogues, Collections, Repertories, Periodicals, etc.), and is further orientated into the field of National Bibliography. Here he learns that what Pirenne, Monod, Dahlmann-Waitz, Wattenbach, Gross, and Altamira have done for other countries, the authors of the *Guide to American History* have done for the United States. With this last volume in his hands, he can quickly learn the best books on any subject of American History from the three viewpoints of time, place, and idea. Beyond this, there is but little scientific guidance. Such necessary works as:

1. *Collections of Printed Sources for American Church History.*
2. *Guide to the Source-Material for American Church History.*
3. *Bibliographia Americana Catholica*, containing lists of books for the study of American Church History

are not in existence, and it becomes a matter of personal direction on the part of the teacher. This grand lacuna might be avoided if each parish priest were to collect all the source-material for the history of his own town and parish; if each bishop were to found a Diocesan Library containing all the published books which in any way deal with his Diocese; if a National Catholic Library were to be instituted containing all the source-material for American Church History. Then a select Bibliography could be compiled. In the next issue, the books dealing with the question of *Historical Criticism* will be discussed.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here does not preclude extended notice in later issues of the* REVIEW)

BRUCE, PHILIP ALEXANDER. *Brave Deeds of Confederate Soldiers.* Philadelphia Pa., George W. Jacobs & Co., 1916. Pp. 351.

BEUCKMAN, REV. FREDERICK. *History of the Diocese of Belleville.* Belleville, Beuchler Publishing Co., 1914. Pp. viii+108.

CASSILLY, FRANCIS, S.J. *The Old Jesuit Mission in Council Bluffs.* Reprint from the Creighton *Chronicle*, February, 1917. Omaha, 1917. Pp. 12.

CLARKE, ISABEL C. *The Rest House.* Benziger Brothers, New York., 1917. Pp. 382.

DUNN, WILLIAM EDWARD. *Spanish and French Rivalry in the Gulf Region of the United States, 1678–1702.* The Beginnings of Texas and Pensacola. Austin, Tex., University of Texas. Pp. 238.

DURWARD, J. T. *The Casket of Joys.* Baraboo, Wis., Pilgrim Publishing Co., 1917. Pp. 55.

DURWARD, J. T. *The Poems of B. I. Durward.* With Life and Criticism on Poetry. Baraboo, Wis., Pilgrim Publishing Co., 1917. Pp. 250.

FLYNN, REV. THOMAS, C. C. *The Master's Word in the Epistles and Gospels.* Sermons for all the Sundays and Principal Feasts of the Year. New York, Benziger Bros., 1917. Vol. i, pp. 302; Vol. ii, pp. 308.

GRAVES, W. W. *Life and Letters of Fathers Ponziglione, Schoenmakers and Other Early Jesuits at Osage Mission.* St. Paul, W. W. Graves, 1916. Pp. 287.

HARDING, SAMUEL BANNISTER. *New Medieval and Modern History.* New York American Book Co., 1913. Pp. xvi+783.

HESS, REV. LUKE, O.S.B. *A Retrospect on the Occasion of the Silver Jubilee of Abbot Ignatius Conrad, O.S.B.* Subiaco, Ark., 1917. Pp. 125.

KELLOGG, LOUISE PHELPS. *Frontier Advance on the Upper Ohio, 1778–1779.* Publications of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Collections, Vol. xxiii, Drapers Series, Vol. iv. Madison, 1916. Pp. 509.

KIEFFER, F. *L'Autorité dans la Famille et à l'Ecole.* Paris, Gabriel Beauchesne, 1917. Pp. ii+489.

LEVI, N. *Jan Smuts:* Being a Character Sketch of Gen. The Hon. J. C. Smuts, K.C., M.L.A., Minister of Defence Union of South Africa. New York, Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co., 1917. Pp. vi+310.

LYNCH, REV. DENIS, S.J. *The Story of the Acts of the Apostles:* A Narrative of the Development of the Early Church. New York: Benziger Bros., 1917. Pp. 295.

MACEACHEN, RODERICK. *Moral Series.* Wheeling, W. Va., 1916. Vols. 5. Vol. i, pp. vi+80; Vol. ii, pp. 198; Vol. iii, pp. 212; Vol. iv, pp. 189; Vol. v, pp. 208.

MCGILL, ANNA BLANCHE. *The Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, Kentucky.* New York, Encyclopedia Press, 1917. Pp. xiv+436.

MEEHAN, THOMAS F. *Thomas Maurice Mulry.* New York, The Encyclopedia Press. Pp. 247.

MOREY, WILLIAM C., PH.D., D.C.L. *Ancient Peoples:* A Revision of Morey's *Outlines of Ancient History.* New York City, American Book Co., 1915. Pp. vi+634.

PALLEN, CONDE B., PH.D., LL.D. *A Memorial of Andrew J. Shipman:* His Life and Writings. New York City, The Encyclopedia Press, 1916. Pp. xvii+362.

POHLE, RIGHT REV. MSGR. JOSEPH, PH.D., D.D., and ARTHUR PREUSS. *The Sacraments.* A Dogmatic Treatise. St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co., 1917 Pp. 164.

POHLE, RIGHT REV. MSGR. JOSEPH, PH.D., D.D., and ARTHUR PREUSS. *Eschatology or The Catholic Doctrine of the Last Things.* A Dogmatic Treatise. St. Louis, B. Herder Bok Co., 1917. Pp. 164.

SADLIER, ANNA T. *Names that Live in Catholic Hearts.* New York, Benziger Bros., 1917. Pp. 265.

SHIELDS, THOMAS EDWARD, PH.D., LL.D. *The Philosophy of Education.* Catholic University Pedagogical Series. Washington, 1917. Pp. 446.

SCOTT-STOWE. *Booker T. Washington: Builder of a Civilization.* New York, Doubleday, Page & Co., 1916. Pp. xx+331.

THYON, ROLLA MILTON. *Household Manufactures in the United States,* 1640–1860 Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1917. Pp. xii+418.

VASSALL-PHILLIPS, REV. O. R., B.A. *The Work of St. Optatus, Bishop of Milevis Against the Donatists.* New York, Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co., 1917. Pp. xxxv+438.

VON RUVILLE, DR. ALBERT. *Das Zeichen des echten Ringes.* Berlin, H. W. Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1916. Pp. xiv+166.

WALKER, PROF. WILLISTON. *The Coming of Yale College of New Haven.* An Historical Address at the Commemoration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Removal of the Collegiate School of Connecticut to New Haven, October 21, 1916. Yale University Press, 1917. Pp. 11.

WEYFORTH, WILLIAM O., PH.D. *The Organization of Labor.* Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science under the Direction of the Departments of History, Political Economy, and Political Science. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1917. Pp. 227+xii.

Goldenes Jubiläum der St. Franz von Sales Gemeinde. 1867–1917. St. Louis. Pp. 244.

Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society at the Annual Meeting Held in Worcester, October 18, 1916. Worcester, Published by the Society. Vol. xxvi, Pt. 2, pp. xxv+203–472.

Records of the Columbia Historical Society, Washington, D. C. Compiled by the Committee on Publications and the Recording Secretary Washington, D. C., Published by the Society, 1917. Pp. iv+325.

The University Record. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, April, 1917. Vol. iii, No. 2, pp. 95.

University of Colorado Bulletin. Catalogue 1916–1917. Boulder. Vol. xvii, No. 3, pp. 326.

World Peace Foundation Pamphlet Series: The New Pan-Americanism. Part iii. Central American League of Nations. Published Bimonthly by the World Peace Foundation, Boston, Mass. Vol. vii, No. 1, pp. 48+xxxiii, 1917.